

The
American Historical Review

ROBERT LE BOUGRE AND THE BEGINNINGS OF
THE INQUISITION IN NORTHERN FRANCE

II.

WITH the exception of an episcopal admonition which has been preserved from the diocese of Thérouanne,¹ existing records do not permit us to say whether the withdrawal of the Dominicans served as a stimulus to the episcopal inquisition. Certainly whatever local efforts may have been made were insufficient to satisfy Gregory IX., and on August 21, 1235, he re-established the Dominican inquisition throughout France. With scarcely suppressed indignation at those who in certain provinces, where they alleged there were no heretics, had murmured against the conduct of the inquisitors, he declared that in every part of the kingdom the poisonous reptiles of heresy swarmed in such numbers that they could no longer be endured or concealed. Against their deceits he commands Robert, like a veteran soldier of the cross, prepared to meet even death in this great cause, to loose the reins of the inquisition "throughout the provinces of Sens, Rheims, and the other provinces of the kingdom of France generally," proceeding with the advice of the bishops, his fellow Dominicans, and other experts (*sapientes*) so that the innocent should not perish or the guilty remain unpunished. The provincial prior was directed to appoint other friars to assist him, and the Archbishop of Sens—and doubtless those of the other provinces—was ordered to co-operate actively with them and such others as might be selected for the purpose.² Thus the

¹ Letter of June 7, 1235 to the provost of St. Martin's at Ypres, with *vidimus* of the Archbishop of Rheims, Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 99. Perhaps the proceedings of the bishop of Noyon against Michel de Cerizy (see bull of December 5, 1235, in Auvray, 2854) belong to this period.

² Bull *Dudum ad aliquorum murmur*, to the provincial prior of the Friars Preachers in France, August 21, 1235 (Auvray, 2736; Potthast, 9993, Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 100). Bull *Dudum*, to Friar Robert, August 23 (Auvray 2735; Potthast 9995; Fre-

papal inquisition was re-established in northern France. Robert was made general inquisitor, he was particularly commended by the Pope, and the bishops were forced to act as his assistants. Under the new commission there were no limitations of place; it covered the whole of France and clothed the inquisitor with full power to proceed under the decrees of the Lateran council and the statutes of 1231.

Armed with his new authority, Friar Robert began a vigorous campaign against heresy among high and low. According to one chronicle his efforts extended over "various cities and towns of France, Flanders, Champagne, Burgundy and the other provinces."¹ Our more specific information relates to Châlons-sur-Marne, where a number of heretics were burnt, notably a certain barber Arnolinus, "entirely devoted to the devil and offensive beyond measure,"² and to the region of the north, where the persecution seems to have raged most violently.³ Apparently Robert began his work in this region by establishing his headquarters at Cambrai, which was not in France at all, but in the territory of the empire.⁴ We are told that he had with him an armed band from the King and that the bishop of Cambrai, Godefroi, who accompanied him also had an armed escort. Their progress through this region began at Péronne, where Pieron Malkasin and Matthieu de Lauvin, their wives,

dericq, I. No. 101; also in abbreviated form, without date, copied from a MS. in the Ottoboni library at Rome, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Collection Moreau, 1193, f. 229). Bull *Quo inter ceteras* to the Archbishop of Sens, August 22 (Auvray 2737; Potthast, 9994; Fredericq, II. No. 28).

¹ *Annales Sancti Medardi Suesionensis*, M. G. H. SS. XXVI. 522; Fredericq, *Corpus*, II. No. 26. Delisle (*Histoire Littéraire de la France*, XXXII. 235 ff.) has shown that these annals are the work of Gobert de Coinci, from 1233 to 1254 prior of Vic-sur-Aisne. Their account of Robert's persecutions, though brief, is sober and accurate.

² Albericus, in M. G. H. SS. XXIII. 937; Fredericq, *Corpus*, II. No. 24.

³ The fullest account of events in the north is contained in the chronicle of Mousket, who was a resident of Tournai, and unless otherwise indicated the narrative in the text is based upon his statements. Vv. 28887 ff. Albericus (l. c.), and Matthew Paris (*Chronica Majora*, III. 361; M. G. H. SS. XXVIII. 133) dismiss the subject very briefly, as do the continuators of André de Marchiennes (M. G. H. SS. XXVI. 215; H. F., XVIII. 559; Fredericq, *Corpus*, II. No. 25) and Siebert de Gembloux (M. G. H. SS. VI. 440), who give the same account, derived perhaps from a common source (cf. Waitz, in M. G. H. SS. XXVI. 204). The chronicle of Hainaut attributed to Baudoin d' Avesnes (H. F., XXI. 166; M. G. H. SS. XXV. 455) has also a brief mention.

Two writers of the fourteenth century, Gilles de Muisit (*De Smedt, Corpus Chronicorum Flandriae*, II. 150) and Jean d' Outremeuse (ed. Borgnet, V. 231) record the persecution of heretics in this period, but their statements have no particular value, as may be seen from the way in which Jean confuses Friar Robert with the more famous Dominican, Albertus Magnus. The extract from Dynter's *Chronica* given by Fredericq (*Corpus*, I. No. 104; Dynter, ed. DeRam, I. 564, 625) is merely a reproduction of the passage in the continuations of André and Siebert. Frederichs' treatment of the northern episode is particularly good.

⁴ Cf. Baudoin d' Avesnes, H. F. XXI. 166.

and Robert de Lauvin were burnt. Matthieu's pregnant daughter was also taken, but by the intercession of the French Queen her life was spared on profession of orthodoxy.¹ Pierre's son fled to Valenciennes but was caught and taken on to Cambrai. On the way back to Cambrai four seigneurs were burnt at Heudicourt.² At Cambrai Robert had with him the Archbishop of Rheims and the bishops of Arras, Cambrai, Tournai, and Noyon, and on the first Sunday in Lent³ a famous sorceress named Alice and some twenty others were burnt—"men of good cheer and in all manner courteous," says Mousket, "except for the fact that they did not believe in God."⁴ Among the notable victims were three who had been chosen *échevins* of the city. Eighteen others were left there in prison, three who recanted were condemned to wear the sign of the cross, and still others were taken on to Douai, where a number of heretics had been collected to await the inquisitors' arrival. The proceedings at Douai were not unduly prolonged, for on the second of March, the second Sunday after the executions at Cambrai, ten heretics, old men and women, were led "out of the gate of Olivet, on the Road of the Lepers, which leads to Lambres" and there burnt in the presence of the Countess of Flanders, the Archbishop of Rheims, and the bishops of Arras, Cambrai, and Tournai.⁵

¹ Later in the reign of St. Louis it was the law that a pregnant woman condemned to death should not be executed before the birth of the child. *Livre de Justice et Plet*, 55.

² "Heldincourt." There are various places in the vicinity of Cambrai with which this may be identified (cf. H. F. XXII. 55). Holder-Egger, Frederichs, and Tanon incline to Élincourt (Nord, arrondissement Cambrai). I prefer Heudicourt (Somme, arrondissement Péronne, canton Roisel) which is directly between Péronne and Cambrai, and was anciently known as Heldincourt (cf. Cagny, *Histoire de l'Arrondissement de Péronne*, II. 723).

³ February 17, 1236. As Frederichs has pointed out, both Waitz and Holder-Egger have confused the chronology of these events by forgetting that in this region the year began at Easter.

⁴ Vv. 28944 ff. On the number compare Albericus, M. G. H. SS. XXIII. 937. The story of a heretic of Cambrai, recounted by Thomas of Cantimpré, *Bonum Universale de Apibus*, II. 57, No. 68 (ed. Douai, 1627, p. 592; cf. Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. Nos. 106, 107) may relate to this persecution.

⁵ This specific account is given by a contemporary chronicle of the town, the *Notae Sancti Amati Duacenses* (M. G. H. SS. XXIV. 30; Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. Nos. 98, 106). Cf. Buzelinus, *Gallo-Flandria* (Douai, 1625), I. 256, 279. Mousket is more general, vv. 28980-28987, but likewise gives the number as ten. The persecution at Douai and Cambrai is also mentioned in the annals of Lobbes (Martène and Durand, *Thesaurus*, III. 1427; M. G. H. SS. IV. 26; Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 94).

Professor Fredericq has had the kindness to send me, in advance of its publication in the third volume of his *Corpus*, the following notice of early persecutions at Douai contained in a MS. of the fifteenth century in the municipal archives of that town (Rég. A. A. 85, f. 17v):

Et y en a plusieurs ars pardevant, tant au quemin des Bougres comme vers le Brielle, comme il est escript ou livre couvert d'argent, qui est en l'église Saint Amet de Douay, comme l'escripant a trouvé en certaines mémoires qu'il a veues.

Some, who professed themselves converted, had their heads shaved and were condemned to wear the cross, others were imprisoned "to repent and to stay."¹ At Lille and in the neighboring villages of Ascq, Lers, and Toufflers,² a number of heretics, amounting perhaps to a score,³ were burnt and others imprisoned. The persecution at Lille seems to have been particularly aimed at merchants and also at a certain Robert de la Galie, against whom Friar Robert was said to have a grudge because of a woman of Milan.⁴ In all, during a period of two or three months, about fifty had been burnt or buried alive.⁵

For the persecutions of the two following years our evidence is very scanty. In the fall of 1237 the Pope declared that heretics were rising more boldly against the vineyard of the Lord,⁶ but no record of a condemnation appears in this year except at Blois, where "there was a burning of the Bugri of the town."⁷ The royal accounts of this year, were they in existence, might tell us more. In 1238 these useful sources show us, in the roll for the Ascension term, that heretics had been convicted at Miraumont, near Péronne, and their goods to the value of eighty *livres* confiscated to the royal treasury.⁸ Matthew Paris mentions under this year a general persecution by Robert, but this may very well be a confusion with the similar entry of two years before.⁹ Toward the close of the summer we find Robert at Paris, examining a witness in the case of the prior of Mazille, in the Nivernais, who was under charge of fautorship of heretics.¹⁰ A writer of the seventeenth century asserts that the inquisition was established at Arras in this year, in the Dominican

¹ Mousket, v. 28987.

² Nord, arr. Lille. Cf. Frederichs, 19.

³ If we accept the statement of Albericus that a good thirty were burnt at Douai and thereabouts, and deduct the ten executed at Douai. Mousket, with whom Albericus agrees in the case of Cambrai, gives no figures for Lille.

⁴ Mousket, vv. 28988-29005. Part of the passage, especially line 29000, is obscure and has perplexed all the editors. I cannot pretend to have any new light upon it.

⁵ Matthew Paris, l. c. This total agrees very well with the more detailed statements of Mousket and Albericus.

⁶ Bull of October 6 to the archbishops and bishops of France (Potthast, 10460). The allusion is to the "little foxes that spoil the vines" (Canticles, ii. 15) which in the Middle Ages, even by the Waldenses themselves, was interpreted to mean the heretics. Cf. Lea, I. 78, note.

⁷ "Annals of La Trinité de Vendôme" in the *English Historical Review*, XIII. 698.

⁸ H. F. XXI. 252 D.

⁹ *Chronica Majora*, III. 520 (M. G. H. SS., XXVIII. 146).

¹⁰ Per idem tempus erat in Francia inquisitor hereticorum frater Robertus de ordine Predicatorum, qui fratrem Iodoinum priorem de Masiliis prosequatur asserens eum esse fautorem hereticorum, ob quam causam dictus abbas [Regnaudus] accessit Parisius, ubi dictus frater Robertus morabatur, inde vero rediens apud Villam Novam Givardi obiit anno Domini MCCXXXVIII, nonis Septembris. *Gesta Abbatum Autisiodorensium*, in Labbe, *Nova Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum*, I. 581. Cf. *Gallia Christiana*, XII. 387.

convent.¹ Certain it is that at some time before 1244 Robert exercised his inquisitorial functions at Arras against Henri Hukedieu, a well-to-do wool merchant of the city.²

The climax of Friar Robert's career as an inquisitor was reached in May, 1239, at Mont-Aimé,³ an ancient seat of heresy in Champagne where a crowd of suspected Manicheans, some of them possibly merchants from the great May fair at Provins,⁴ had been collected from all parts of the country. Their examination lasted the better part of a week, being attended by the Archbishop of Rheims and ten of his suffragans, as well as by the bishops of Orleans, Troyes, Meaux, Verdun, and Langres, and "many abbots, priors and deans,"⁵ and ended on Friday, May 13, in a "holocaust, very

¹ Fredericq, *Corpus*, II. No 29. See also Proville, *Histoire du convent des Dominicains d'Arras* (Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. fr. 11620), 387, 683, citing a modern MS. of the convent.

² Letter patent of Asson, bishop of Arras, April, 1244 (or possibly 1245, since Easter in 1245 fell on April 16), recognizing that Hukedieu had been excommunicated by Robert. Original, with traces of seal, in the Archives du Pas-de-Calais, A. 10⁵. Published by Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 121, from a cartulary at Lille.

On Henri Hukedieu see Jeanroy et Guy, *Chansons et Dits Artésiens du XIII^e Siècle* (Bordeaux, 1898), 80, 121, 132; and Guesnon in the *Bulletin Historique et Philologique* for 1898, 192, and in the *Moyen Age*, new series, IV. 31.

³ Marne, arrondissement of Châlons, commune of Bergères-les-Vertus. Cf. Longnon, *Dictionnaire Topographique de la Marne*, 171, where the numerous variants of the name are given. The different medieval forms of this name have caused some confusion, and have even given one writer a lame excuse for doubting the fact of the great burning (*Histoire Littéraire*, XVIII. 249). On the early history of heresy at Mont-Aimé see Schmidt, *Histoire des Cathares*, I. 33, 41.

For the great *auto da fe* of 1239 we have the brief report of an eye-witness, the Dominican Étienne de Bourbon, in his *Anecdotes Historiques*, ed. Lecoy de la Marche, 150, 415 ("Cui sentencie ego interfui"). The fullest account is given by Albericus (M. G. H. SS. XXIII. 944-945; H. F. XXI. 623), who lived in the same diocese. Mousket mentions the affair (vv. 30525 ff., omitted in the extracts in the M. G. H.), as do also the Dominican annals of Erfurt (*Monumenta Erphurtensia*, ed. Holder-Egger, 96, 235; Böhmer, *Fontes Rerum Germanicarum*, II. 400; M. G. H. SS. XVI. 33). It is also noted by two writers of a somewhat later date: Jean de S. Victor, in his *Memoriale Historiarum* (Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. Lat. 14626, f. 339 v.; Quétif and Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, I. 190); and Geoffroy de Courlon, *Chronique de l'Abbaye de S. Pierre-le-Vif de Sens*, ed. Julliot (Sens, 1876), 518 (H. F., XXII. 3; omitted in the extracts printed in the M. G. H.). Through the kindness of my colleague, Dr. Grant Showerman, I have seen collations of the two MSS. of Geoffroy in the Vatican (Reg. Christ. 455 and 480) which have not been used by the editors. The MS. of Sens on which the published text is based places the execution of heretics "apud Moimerillonem," which the editors of the H. F. identified with Montmorillon in the department of the Vienne. The Vatican MS. Reg. Chr. 480, f. 117, has "Moimer," a common form of the name of Mont-Aimé.

⁴ We know at least that Robert on one occasion summoned a merchant of Arras to appear before him "in quibusdam nundinis de Campania" (Archives du Pas-de-Calais, A. 10⁵; Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 121), and the Erfurt annals mention expressly the nearness of Mont-Aimé to Provins. The May fair regularly began the Tuesday before Ascension (Bourquetel, *Les Foires de Champagne*, I. 81), which in 1239 would bring it on May 3, just before the trial of the heretics began.

⁵ Albericus, who mentions the bishops by name.

great and pleasing to God," in which more than a hundred and eighty Cathari were burnt, after receiving the sacrament of the *consolamentum* from their "archbishop."¹ "And so," concludes Albericus, "as the story runs that dogs once came from all directions and tore themselves to pieces in a battle at this same place, as a sort of prophecy of what was to be, so these Bougri, worse than dogs, were there exterminated in one day to the triumph of holy church." Not all of the ecclesiastical dignitaries remained for the end, but the Count of Champagne and King of Navarre, Thibaut IV., was there with his barons, and the crowd present, of both sexes and all ages and classes, was estimated by Albericus, with characteristically medieval looseness in dealing with large numbers, at seven hundred thousand.²

After the great *auto da fe* of 1239 comparatively little is known of Friar Robert's acts as an inquisitor. Like his contemporary pioneer of the papal inquisition in Germany, Conrad of Marburg, Robert seems to have pursued his victims with a fury which bordered upon mania,³ and it is not strange that a reaction occurred against the friar and his methods. It does not appear that this arose from any feeling of pity for the terrible end of those who persisted in their heretical beliefs; worse than dogs, their destruction was pleasing to God, declared the monk of Trois-Fontaines, and he had the thirteenth century with him.⁴ If the persecutions had been confined to those who were clearly guilty, it is not likely that serious protests would have been made. According to Matthew Paris, however, Robert passed the bounds of moderation and justice, and in the pride of his power and of the terror that he inspired punished the simple and innocent along with the wicked. "Great numbers of innocent people were infatuated by him and then handed over to their

¹ On the *consolamentum* see Lea, I. 96, with the additional note in the French translation. The different accounts are in strikingly close agreement as to the number. Albericus has 183, Mousket 187, the Annals of Erfurt 184. Étienne de Bourbon in one passage gives "about 180," in the other "more than 80"—the latter with an evident omission of the hundred. Jean de S. Victor has 180; Geoffrey de Courlon gives no number.

² Bourquelot in his *Histoire de Provins* (I. 183) says that the local antiquary Grillon speaks of similar executions at Troyes and Provins, but I have found no contemporary evidence.

³ "Un homicide maniaque," he is called by Langlois, in the *Histoire de France* of Lavis, III. 2, 73.

⁴ Albericus in M. G. H. SS. XXIII. 944. Still there are some who pitied the fate of heretics, as we learn from a general of the Dominicans, Humbert of Romans, in a work written for the instruction of preachers: In condemnatione hereticorum quando sententia fertur contra eos, solent publice homines convocari, et quia sunt multi qui quadam falsa pietate moventur circa eos et iudicant ecclesiam de nimia crudelitate circa illos, expedit in sermone publice ostendere quare ecclesia de hereticis plusquam de aliis peccatoribus diligentius inquirat, et quare gravius istos punit, et quare eos difficiliter ad penitentiam recipit. *Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum*, XXV. 555.

death,"¹ until at length he was peremptorily removed from office by the Pope, and "when his crimes—which it were better not to mention—became known, he was condemned to perpetual imprisonment." What the dark deeds were which the monk of St. Alban's prefers to pass over in silence, our other sources do not enable us to say with much definiteness. The rare appeals from Robert's sentences relate only to the earlier stages of the inquisitorial procedure; they show his persistence in the pursuit of those upon whom suspicion of heresy had once rested, his arbitrariness and impatience of interference, but they tell us no more than this. One story, however, has come down to us unnoticed in the pages of a gossiping chronicler of the time, and the new light that it may serve to throw on the friar's methods justifies its quotation at some length.² In substance it runs as follows:

Robert had by magic art made a bit of writing (*cartula*) which when placed on any one's head compelled him to say whatever the friar desired. One day while preaching he was smitten with the beauty of a woman in the crowd, and when she refused to yield to him he threatened to have her burnt as a heretic. So approaching her in public he seized her and said, "Are you not a heretic?" She answered, "I am indeed." "Will you return to the Catholic faith?" "No." "Would you rather be burnt than recant?" "Yes." Whereupon he said, "You have all heard how this woman has confessed her baseness." The bystanders were surprised and said they had never heard such a thing of her, and she was put in prison. The woman had a son, a well-disposed youth and a clerk, who was much disturbed over his mother's dangerous position and went about among his neighbors and relatives seeking advice as to how he might get her free. A certain man who knew the friar well was moved by sympathy for the young man and said to him: "Go tomorrow to the public meeting where your mother will have her second examination. Stand near her, and when Master Robert places his hand on her and begins to question her on her belief, seize his hand, for you are stronger, and take away the writing which you will find in it. Keep it yourself, and ask him in a loud voice to examine your mother again." This was done, and when the clerk had taken the writing out of the friar's hand and his mother was questioned as before, she swore that she had never been examined by Master Robert concerning her faith and had never given him any answers at all, nor had she even heard what heresy

¹ Tandem abutens potestate sibi concessa, et fines modestiae transgrediens et justitiae, elatus, potens, et formidabilis, bonos cum malis confundens involvit, et insontes et simplices punivit. Auctoritate igitur papali jussus est praecise ne amplius in illo officio fulminando desaeuaret. Qui postea, manifestius clarescentibus culpis suis, quae melius aestimo reticere quam explicare, adjudicatus est perpetuo carceri mancipari. *Chronica Majora*, ed. Luard, III. 320; M. G. H. SS. XXVIII. 147. Dicebatur . . . infinitos infatuasse et infatuatos innocuos incendio tradidisse. *Ib.*, V. 247; XXVIII. 326. Cf. the *Historia Anglorum*, ed. Madden, II. 415; M. G. H. SS. XXVIII. 411.

² Richer de Senones, *Chronicon* in M. G. H. SS. XXV. 307-308 (omitted in the edition of D'Achery): De magistro Roberto Parisiensi ordinis Predicatorum et fallacis eius . . . On Richer as an historian see Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, II. 399.

was. Then the young man showed the writing to all and explained how by means of it Robert deceived whom he would and delivered them to death. When the people heard this, they tried to kill the friar, but he was carried off by the clergy and put in a stone prison perpetually closed. And because, in order to conceal his own iniquity, he had by such devices caused his father and mother and many other innocent people to be burnt, God imposed such a penalty on him in this life, if perchance he should turn from his evil ways while yet alive.

Whether Richer has here given us the real occasion of Friar Robert's downfall it is impossible to say, but if we substitute hypnotic suggestion for the *cartula*, there is nothing impossible in the story, and it agrees in a general way with the statement of Matthew Paris respecting the "infatuation" of the innocent. With regard to the friar's imprisonment and subsequent fate two other accounts have been preserved, and while they form no part of the history of the inquisition, their neglect by later writers¹ warrants their insertion here. In a chronicle attributed to Matthew Paris we read that Robert, after procuring the burning of many thousands in Flanders, was "at length, by the judgment of the members of his order—who condemn no one to death—put in prison to do perpetual penance for his horrible crimes; but ultimately, by means of a large sum of money he succeeded in securing a papal dispensation which, to prevent further scandal, permitted him to be received as a canon of St. Victor."² This is confirmed and supplemented by a collection of biographies of Dominicans compiled toward 1260 for circulation among members of the order, where Robert figures as a terrible example of the "evil end of apostates":

There was a certain other man in France who had the office of inquisitor and was in such renown that almost the whole of France trembled before him and even the great held him in the highest reverence. Relying on his popularity, he became insolent and unwilling to govern himself by the advice of his elders, so that the friars at Paris kept him for a long time in bonds until his friends finally succeeded in inducing the Pope to have him released and received into another order. He joined first the brothers of the Trinity and then those of St. Victor, but having been expelled from each of these orders because of his evil deeds, he at last entered Clairvaux. Here he began with great honor, but when his wickedness—which God did not allow to remain hidden long—was discovered, he was reduced to a vile position in that monastery. And so, hav-

¹The passage attributed to Matthew Paris does not seem to have been used. That from Gérard de Frachet was printed in an out of the way part of the *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum* of Quétif and Echart (II. 543), where it was noticed by Proville, *Histoire du Couvent des Dominicains d'Arras* (Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. Fr. 11620, pp. 420 ff.) and by Chapotin, *Histoire des Dominicains de la Province de France*, 224.

²*Abbrecciatio Chronicorum Angliae*, in Madden's edition of the *Historia Anglorum*, III. 278; M. G. H. SS. XXVIII. 448. On the authority of the Dominicans to imprison erring brothers see the *acta* of the general chapters of 1238 and 1240, *Acta Capitulum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. Reichert, I. 10, 16; and Potthast, 11089.

ing been confounded before many, he died not long afterward in great shame and sorrow.¹

In the present state of our information it is not possible to determine accurately the date at which Robert le Bougre ceased to exercise his functions as inquisitor. If his commission was revoked by the Pope, the bull is not recorded in the papal registers, and if he was removed from office by a legate or by the general of the Dominican order,² the chances for the preservation of a documentary record are still less. As there is no notice of any condemnations made by Robert after the great burning of 1239, Lea³ and Tanon⁴ assume that he fell from power in that year, while Frederichs⁵ places the date "about 1241." On the whole I am inclined to believe that he remained in office at least as late as 1244 or 1245. A careful contemporary chronicle states that the persecutions of heretics went on until 1241 and later.⁶ In the summer of 1242 a preaching friar Robert, of Saint-Jacques, appears as one of the ex-

¹Gerardus de Fracheto, *Vitae Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. Reichert (Rome and Stuttgart, 1897), 292. The author entered the order in 1225 and lived mostly at Limoges; the work was composed between 1256 and 1260, but touched up afterward. Cf. the introduction, xvi., and pp. 4 and 5 of the text. Although the passage plainly refers to Robert, his name does not appear in the MSS. given by Reichert; but Echard (II. 543) states that the name appears in his own contemporary MS. One of the MSS. collated by Reichert adds that Robert began to sow discord at Clairvaux.

In view of this passage it is curious to see the efforts of certain modern Dominicans to clear Friar Robert's memory. Bremond, in his notes to Ripoll (*Bullarium Fratrum Praedicatorum*, I. 81) scolds Spondanus for accepting the statements of so untrustworthy a writer as Matthew Paris, whose works were interpolated by an heretical hand. Instead of being imprisoned later, Robert died at Saint-Jacques in 1235—"ut liquet ex praeis monumentis ejusdem conventus"! Choquet claims for him the glorious crown of martyrdom as the friar Robert who was killed at Avignonnet in 1242 (Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. p. 111). Provill (l. c.) thinks it unlikely that such a man as Robert could become suddenly perverted, believes him too old to have gone through so many religious orders, and finally takes refuge behind the absence of his name from the MSS. of Gérard. Danzas (*Études sur les Temps Primitifs de l'Ordre de S. Dominique*, IV. 470 ff.) gives extracts from the very chapter of Gérard, but does not mention Robert. Chapotin (l. c. 224) concludes that if Robert passed the bounds of justice and humanity, the Pope and the Dominican order did not fail to punish him. Echard alone, best scholar of them all, faces the facts squarely, declaring Robert "hominem ab ordine extorrem, nec iam ex ordine memorandum" (*Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, II. 543).

²The general of the Dominicans was authorized by a bull of July 7, 1246, to remove inquisitors, even when they had been appointed by the Pope, and appoint others in their stead. Douais, *Documents pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Inquisition en Languedoc*, xiv. A similar bull for the Franciscans had been issued in January of the same year (Potthast, 11993).

³*History of the Inquisition*, II. 116; *Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary*, 53, note.

⁴*Tribunaux de l'Inquisition*, 116.

⁵*Robert le Bougre*, 27, 32.

⁶Non solum istud factum est in isto anno [1236] sed ante per tres continuos annos et post per quinque continuos annos et plus. *Annals of St. Médard of Soissons*, M. G. H. SS. XXVI. 522.

In Lea's *Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary*, 52, there is a letter addressed to "the archbishop of Sens and Friar R." concerning the penance of a follower of Simon

ecutors of a will in Flanders,¹ and the following January we find mention, in a Paris document, of a "clerk of Friar Robert of the order of the Preachers."² Robert's fall is not referred to by Mousket, who died in 1244 or 1245,³ and indeed in April of one of these years the bishop of Arras gives notice of Robert's excommunication of Hukedieu.⁴ On the other hand it is known that the friar died before 1263,⁵ and from the account given of the various other orders through which he passed, it is plain that he must have left the Dominicans several years before.

In tracing the career of Friar Robert as an inquisitor we have had little occasion to speak of those engaged with him in the task of hunting out and punishing heresy. By the Pope's commission he had been directed to proceed, "with the advice of prelates, other Dominicans and experts,"⁶ and as a matter of fact he does not often appear as acting alone. There is, it is true, but scant mention of other Dominican inquisitors, acting either individually or as his associates,⁷ and the only instance of the employment of an "expert" is the presence at Châlons of the chancellor of the University of Paris, Philippe de Grève, an eminent theologian and a staunch de Montfort, who was to accompany Simon on his crusade. If we were to follow Bémont (*Simon de Montfort*, 12) in the statement that Simon took the cross after hearing of the defeat at Gaza, which occurred November 13, 1239, the document would belong to the year 1240, before the month of June, when Simon set forth for the East (Röhrich, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem*, 850). However, a bull of February 25, 1238 (Bliss, *Calendar of Papal Letters*, I. 167) shows that the crusade had been vowed as early as 1238.

¹ Testament of Arnoul d'Audenarde, June and August, 1242, in *Inventaire . . . des Archives de la Chambre des Comptes de Lille* (Lille, 1865), I. 307, Nos. 740, 741.

² Brièle et Coyecque, *Les Archives de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Paris*, 225, No. 466.

³ Pirenne, in the *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*, XV. 329.

⁴ The date is April, 1244, but as Easter fell on April 3 in 1244, and on April 16 in 1245, the document may belong to either of these years. Archives du Pas-de-Calais, A. 105; Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 121.

⁵ Quondam frater Robertus dictus Lepetit, tunc ordinis fratrum Predicatorum, in illis partibus inquisitor pravitatis hujusmodi. Bull *Constitutus* of Urban IV., October 29, 1263, in Chapotin, 224.

⁶ Cum prelatorum et fratrum tuorum religiosorum sapientumque consilio. Bull *Dudum*, in Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 101; Potthast, 9995; Auvray, 2735. On the advisers of inquisitors in general see Henner, *Beiträge zur Organisation und Kompetenz der päpstlichen Ketzergerichte*, 138 ff.

⁷ A Dominican friar Jacques was with Robert in Champagne early in 1234 (see the documents printed above, p. 454), and a Franciscan acted with him in one instance at La Charité (Auvray, 2825; Potthast, 10044). Robert and the Paris prior also receive a joint commission of inquiry in one case (Auvray, 2221; Potthast, 9772). The only examples of independent action I have found are at Troyes, where the Dominican prior and a Franciscan of the same city appear as assigning penance (bull of March 11, 1236, Auvray, 3006; Potthast, 10114), and at Arras, where a modern history of the Dominican convent mentions Pierre Danvin, or Darwin, as inquisitor in 1238 (Proville, *Histoire du convent des Dominicains d'Arras*, Bibliothèque Nationale MS. Fr. 11620, pp. 387, 683). The case at Troyes must have been subsequent to 1232, when the Dominicans were established there (Chapotin, *Histoire des Dominicains de la Province de France*, 179).

upholder of orthodoxy;¹ but there is abundant evidence that the bishops of northern France were actively associated in the work of the inquisition. At Cambrai, besides the bishop of the diocese, he had with him the Archbishop of Rheims and the bishops of Arras, Tournai, and Noyon,² and all of these, except the last-named, were likewise present at Douai.³ At Mont-Aimé the number of prelates was so great that Albericus enumerates sixteen and an eye-witness speaks of the presence of "almost all of the bishops of France."⁴ Furthermore, it is plain from the words of the chroniclers that the presence of the bishops was not merely formal, but that they conducted the examination of the accused. We have specific statements to this effect relative to the persecutions at Cambrai and Mont-Aimé,⁵ and the annals of St. Médard sum up the whole matter accurately when they say that "by the instrumentality of a certain preaching friar Robert, a great multitude of heretics was taken, examined, and convicted by archbishops, bishops, and prelates of the other ecclesiastical degrees."⁶ Whatever may have been the practice in less celebrated cases, it is clear that the responsibility for the great burning of heretics in the north and in Champagne rests with the leaders of the French clergy quite as much as with the terrible friar.

Of the independent action of the bishops in the pursuit of heresy, the episcopal inquisition proper, we hear very little in northern France, either in the time of Friar Robert or later.⁷ The absence of records is probably due in the first instance to the lack of any noteworthy proceedings to record, at least at a time when the papal inquisitor was taking the initiative so vigorously and the bishops were so busily occupied in considering the cases which he brought before them, and yet if the sources permitted a study of the relations of the papal inquisition to the local ecclesiastical authorities, we should probably hear more of the local jealousies of Dominican

¹ Albericus in M. G. H. SS. XXIII. 937.

² Mousket, vv. 28915, 28958-28961.

³ M. G. H. SS., XXIV., 30.

⁴ *Fere omnes episcopi Francie*. Étienne de Bourbon, *Anecdotes Historiques*, 150, and cf. 415. See further Albericus in M. G. H. SS. XXIII., 944, and Mousket, vv. 30535, 30536. Other examples of bishops associated with Robert are those of Clermont (Auvray 2825; Potthast 10044), Cahors (probably; Lea, *Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary*, XXXV., 1), and Arras (Fredericq, *Corpus I.*, 121, and note), the Archbishop of Sens (Lea, XXXV., 2), and the Archbishop of Sens and the bishop of Troyes (Potthast, 10114; Auvray, 3006).

⁵ Mousket, v. 28885; Étienne de Bourbon, 415. Cf. Albericus in M. G. H. SS. XXIII., 945.

⁶ M. G. H. SS., XXVI. 522.

⁷ The material for the episcopal inquisition in the Netherlands in this period has been collected by Fredericq, *Geschiedenis*, I. Ch. 6.

interference whose faint echoes reach us in the papal documents of the period.¹ The duties of the bishops in the suppression of heresy did not cease with the establishment of the Dominican inquisition, and some effort was certainly made to put new energy into the episcopal machinery for the detection and punishment of unbelief. In 1239 the provincial council of Tours sought to revive the old institution of the synodal witnesses by prescribing the appointment in each parish of three persons sworn to reveal all offenses concerning the faith.² Somewhat later, councils of the province of Sens decided to coerce obstinate excommunicates by bringing them before the council as heretics.³ From the diocese of Tournai there has been preserved a proclamation against heresy, written in the Romance tongue, which was to be read in the parish churches every other Sunday,⁴ and in the adjoining diocese of Théroutanne we find the bishop instructing the parish priests to see that the people do not fall under suspicion of heresy by remaining away from church.⁵ Some actual cases of the pursuit of heretics by the bishop are also found, in the diocese of Troyes,⁶ and in the diocese of Noyon, where in 1235 a priest was kept in close confinement in spite of his vigorous assertions of orthodoxy and proffers of proof,⁷ while a few years later, the bishops of Cambrai, just over the northern frontier, showed their zeal for the suppression of heresy and social discontent at Antwerp.⁸ At Paris, too, the bishops and the masters of theology kept a careful watch against theological error,⁹ and the bishop's prison awaited those who persisted in upholding forbidden doctrines,¹⁰ while

¹ Bulls *Dudum ad aliquorum murmur* and *Quo inter ceteras* of 1235. Auvray 2735-2737; Potthast, 9993-9995; Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. 100, 101, II. 28. For the late thirteenth century see Fredericq, *Geschiedenis*, I. 68-71.

There were also differences among the secular clergy, so that in a controversy with his suffragans the Archbishop of Rheims even went so far as to assert that some of them were tainted with heresy (Varin, *Archives Administratives de Reims*, I. 675; Potthast, 12062), but there is no evidence that the charge was substantiated.

² Mansi, XXIII. 497; Hefele-Knöpfner, V. 1083. Cf. also the council of Trier in 1238, in Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 115, and for the south the councils cited in Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, V. 449, note 4.

³ Concilium Parisiense, 1248, c. 20; Concilium Pruvinese, 1251. Mansi, XXIII. 768, 793; Hefele-Knöpfner, V. 1151, VI. 45.

⁴ Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 158 (undated, but evidently of the thirteenth century).

⁵ Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 99 (1235).

⁶ Lea, *Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary*, XXXVII. 2.

⁷ The case of Michel de Cerizy, Auvray, 2854.

⁸ Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. Nos. 125, 126, 133; *Geschiedenis*, I. 84.

⁹ See the notices of errors condemned in 1241, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisensis*, I. No. 128; in 1247, *ibid.* No. 176; in 1270, *ibid.* No. 432; and in 1277, *ibid.* No. 473. Cf. also No. 522 and the documents relating to the condemnation of the Talmud, especially No. 178. On the condemnations of 1270 and 1277 see Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant*.

¹⁰ *Chartularium* I., No. 176. It is worth noting that the papal legate who acted when Master Raymond was condemned the second time uses the phrase "de bonorum consilio," so common in the inquisitorial documents of the south.

the time was coming when the University of Paris would virtually supplant the inquisition as an agency for the maintenance of orthodoxy in France.¹ Still, when all known instances of such sporadic local activity are enumerated, they make a small showing in comparison with the persistent labors of the papal inquisitors.

When we turn from the external history of the persecutions of heretics by Friar Robert and his associates to an examination of their procedure and the penalties which they inflicted, we are embarrassed by the scarcity of evidence and its one-sided character. An occasional summons, a few appeals from sentences in which appellants state their version of the case to the Pope, some forms of the papal penitentiary, and the incidental statements of the chroniclers, constitute our only sources.² This material is too fragmentary to serve as the basis of a special study of the methods of the inquisition, yet it is valuable as far as it goes and has been little used by the general writers on the subject;³ and for the sake of comparison with the course of the papal inquisition elsewhere and with the earlier practice in northern France, it may be worth while to bring together what may be learned of the procedure of the inquisition in the north in the time of Gregory IX.

On his first visit to La Charité Friar Robert began with the usual preliminary sermon⁴ exhorting heretics to return to the faith,

¹ Lea, II. 135 ff.

² The only cases in which we have any extended account of Robert's method of procedure are: At La Charité, the appeals of Pierre Vogrin (Sbaralea, *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I. 177; Auvray, 2825; Potthast, 10044) and Petronilla (Auvray, 3106) and the petition of Jean Chevalier (Chapotin, *Histoire des Dominicains de la Province de France*, 224), all of them statements by the accused (Cf. also the appeal of a certain M. of the diocese of Cahors in Lea, *Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary*, XXXVIII. 2). At Arras the excommunication of Hukedieu (Archives du Pas de Calais, A. 105; Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 121), where Robert's proceedings are described by the excommunicating bishop. At Paris (?) Richer's story of the woman who was compelled by magic to make a false confession (M. G. H. SS. XXV. 307). For the procedure of the episcopal inquisition in the same period we have only the case of the bishop of Noyon and Michel de Cerizy (Auvray, 2854); the earlier cases at La Charité should of course be compared.

³ On the procedure of the inquisition in general see Lea, I. 399 ff.; Tanon, 326 ff.; Hinschius, V. 481 ff. Important information on the early procedure of the papal inquisition is afforded by certain consultations of the papal penitentiary, Raymond de Peñafort, relative to the treatment of heretics in the province of Tarragona. See the *Moyen Age*, second series, III. 305-325; and *Raymundiana* (*Monumenta Ordinis Praedicatorum*, VI.), II. 41, 73. For Languedoc, in the years 1250-1267, see the elaborate study of the workings of the inquisition at Carcassonne in Molinier, *L'Inquisition dans le Midi de la France*, 273-451; the register of the *greffier*, upon which Molinier's account is based, and the important *Sentences* of Bernard de Caux and Jean de S. Pierre (1244-1248) have recently been published by Douais in his *Documents pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Inquisition dans le Languedoc*.

⁴ On which see Tanon, 329; Hinschius, 458, note 3, 481; Forms of citation to such a sermon may be seen in Martène and Durand, *Thesaurus*, V. 1810; and in the *Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit*, for 1883, 671.

with the result, so he tells us, that not only those who were specially summoned, but many who did not wait for his summons and some who were not even suspected, came forward to confess their error and undergo penance. Information was freely offered against others, parents even "denouncing their children and children their parents, husbands their wives and wives their husbands." Robert had as yet no special authority in France, but in the commission which he soon received from the Pope indulgence was promised to all who attended his preaching and assisted him in his work.¹ Prompt confession, where no accusation had been made, relieved the heretic from further pursuit, only a moderate penance being exacted;² and information against others was so much desired that even after sentence of death had been pronounced, a reprieve might be granted on promise of producing other victims.³ From all accounts, Robert lent a ready ear to all accusations, and when his suspicions had once fastened on any one, it was difficult to secure release. At La Charité we have already seen his relentless pursuit of Pierre Vogrin, who had been twice acquitted by the episcopal inquisition,⁴ and the same unwillingness to accept the findings of his predecessors was shown in the case of a certain Petronilla of the same town who also offered canonical purgation without success.⁵ Particularly in the case of merchants, whose wandering life and close relations with Italy and southern France made them natural objects of suspicion, did the papal inquisition exercise unusual watchfulness. Thus a Florentine merchant who had talked with certain heretics whom he supposed to be orthodox and given their servants ten sous, first confessed to a Dominican and a Franciscan at Troyes, who assigned him penance; he then consulted the Pope, who after referring the matter to the bishop of Florence and receiving his report, approved by a cardinal, respecting the merchant's unblemished reputation in Italy for purity of faith, still found it necessary, after imposing penance, to have his orthodoxy further investigated in France by Friar Robert, the Archbishop of Sens, and the bishop of Troyes.⁶ A man from the diocese of Cahors

¹ Bull *Gaudemus*, Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 90.

² Si predictus G. non accusatus nec convictus sed sponte confessus est et suum confitetur errorem et ea que exiguntur in talibus, abiurata prorsus heretica pravitate, de absolutionis beneficio iuxta formam ecclesie providentis eidem, iniungentes ei penitentiam salutarem et alia prout in similibus censure debite modus et ordo deprecunt. *Lea, Formulary*, XXXV. 1; MS. Tours 594, f. 29 v., No. 141.

³ Albericus in M. G. H. SS. XXIII. 945.

⁴ Potthast, 10044; Auvray, 2825.

⁵ Auvray, 3106.

⁶ Bull *Ildebrandiscus* of March 11, 1236, printed in Sbaralea, *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I. 188; *Raymundiana*, II. 49; Potthast, 10114; Auvray, 3006. Similar bull of November 23, 1234 ("Accurri" . . .) in *Raymundiana*, II. 27; Auvray, 2221;

who had once consorted with heretics and listened to their preaching confessed his error to the local authorities and was admitted to penance, but on coming north he was accused of heresy by his enemies and put in prison by Robert in spite of the letter of security which he carried.¹ Another case is that of Jean Chevalier, of La Charité, who had consorted with a woman suspected of heresy; though he established his own soundness in the faith upon examination, he was nevertheless condemned to an elaborate public penance, with the further threat that if he ever took usury or visited Lombardy he would be considered as a heretic and treated accordingly.²

The manner of citation before the inquisitors is illustrated most fully in a case from the later years of Friar Robert's activity, the facts being related by the bishop of Arras on the testimony of parish priests of his diocese, who constituted the usual intermediary between the inquisitor and the suspected party.³ Robert proclaimed several times that the accused, a wool merchant named Henri Hukedieu, should appear before him at a place which he was ready to designate and should there answer the questions which the friar desired to propound; then in a public sermon a certain fair in Champagne was set as the time for the merchant to appear and establish his innocence, and after the time had elapsed without his coming, Robert excommunicated him as a heretic in a public sermon at Arras.⁴

That a formal examination preceded conviction is often stated by the chroniclers,⁵ who sometimes describe the beliefs to which the heretics confessed,⁶ but we are left very much in the dark as regards the nature of the proceedings. Usually, as we have seen, bishops were present and took an active part in the examination, but in two cases, of which we know, Robert appears to have conducted the trial alone. The woman of La Charité, Petronilla, was required to prove her assertion of innocence by the oath of three compurgators, but when she appeared for this purpose the friar declared that she had failed and put her in prison, along with her son-in-law, whose purgation had formerly been accepted.⁷ In Richer's story of the pro-

Pothast, 9772. These are a number of papal bulls of this period for the protection of Italian merchants in northern France, e. g., Auvray, 2842, 2843, 2857, 2764.

¹ Lea, *Formulary*, XXXVIII. 2; MS. Tours 594, f. 30 v., No. 148.

² Bull *Constitutus*, in Chapotin, 224.

³ Cf. Tanon, 340; Henner, *Ketzergerichte*, 292. An order from the bishop of Auxerre to a priest of La Charité to summon a suspected person (1233) is cited in Lebeuf, *Mémoires concernant l'Histoire . . . d'Auxerre* (ed. Challe et Quantin), I. 411.

⁴ Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 121.

⁵ See the passages cited above, apropos of the participation of the bishops.

⁶ Étienne de Bourbon, *Anecdotes Historiques*, 149; Albericus, in M. G. H. SS. XXIII. 945.

⁷ Auvray, 3106.

ceedings in the case of the woman under the influence of the *cartula* we have a case of enforced confession. Robert approaches her suddenly in public with the questions: "Are you not a heretic?" "Will you return to the Catholic faith?" "Would you rather be burnt than recant?" She admits the charges whereupon he calls the bystanders to witness her statements and puts her in prison. The same questions are repeated at a second examination, which is likewise public.¹ With the exception of these instances and the general statement of Matthew Paris that Robert punished the innocent as well as the guilty,² we know nothing of the rigor of the examination or the frequency of acquittal. It is at this stage in the proceedings, between accusation and conviction, that such appeals as have come down to us were lodged with the Pope. From an inquisitorial condemnation for heresy no such appeal was possible,³ but in three of the cases we have been considering an appeal to the Pope was taken before sentence was pronounced, and in all three the Pope orders further investigation. In each instance, in addition to the innocence of the accused, some irregularity in the proceedings was alleged—either imprisonment in spite of a letter of protection,⁴ or refusal to accept compurgation, followed by arbitrary imprisonment,⁵ or in one case the violation of an agreement which had been made to guarantee a fair hearing, and excommunication after appeal had been taken.⁶

Impenitent heretics, after they had been condemned by the church, were regularly handed over to the secular power to suffer their "due punishment" of death by burning. Whatever the origin of capital punishment for heresy in the Middle Ages, whether it was inherited from the legislation of the Roman emperors or was introduced from the popular practice of the Germanic nations,⁷ by the middle of the thirteenth century the stake had become the regular

¹ M. G. H. SS., XXV. 307.

² *Ibid.*, XXVIII. 147, 326.

³ Tanon, 435; Hinschius, V. 467.

⁴ Lea, *Formulary*, XXXVIII. 2.

⁵ Auvray, 3106.

⁶ Pierre Vogrin; Potthast, 10044.

⁷ The theory of the Germanic origin of the laws for the execution of heretics is worked out in the classical monographs of Ficker, *Die gesetzliche Einführung der Todesstrafe für Ketzerie*, in the *Mittheilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, I. 177-226, 430, and Havet, *L'Hérésie et le Bras Séculier au Moyen-Âge*, in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XLI. 488-517, 570-607 (and in his *Œuvres*, II. 117-180). Their results have been accepted by Lea (I. 222), Fredericq (*Geschiedenis*, I. chs. 7-9), Hinschius (*Kirchenrecht*, V. 379), and Hansen (*Zauberwahn, Inquisition und Hexenprozess*, 220 ff.). The Roman origin of the penalty is upheld by Tanon, 441 ff. (Cf. also Viollet, *Établissements de S. Louis*, I. 253; and Guilhermiz in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, LV. 383.)

penalty in northern Europe, a penalty which prefigured, it was declared, the unquenchable fire of the world to come.¹

Those who repented of their heresy were admitted by the church to undergo penance.² The most severe form, reserved for those who repented from fear of death, consisted of perpetual imprisonment, either in the milder form of detention within the prison walls (*murus largus*) or in the harsh solitary confinement of a narrow cell (*murus strictus*), where in many cases the prisoner was also chained to the wall.³ A less severe but exceedingly humiliating form of punishment, often substituted for imprisonment, was the *poena confusibilis* of wearing some conspicuous sign of infamy, such as a yellow cross on the breast and back. For lesser degrees of guilt the ordinary penances of pilgrimages and pious observances could be prescribed in the discretion of the judge. In the case of priests the more serious punishments for heresy must be preceded by degradation from orders, but so great was the difficulty of getting together the number of bishops canonically required to perform this act that it was early found necessary to simplify and expedite the procedure so that the diocesan might act alone with the advice of such as he might summon from his diocese.⁴

These general principles of inquisitorial practice Friar Robert seems to have observed. "Many he consumed with avenging

¹ Philippe de Grève, chancellor of the University of Paris, says of the baker of Rheims burnt in 1230: *Translatus est ad furnum temporalis poenae et deinde ad furnum gehennae* (Hauréau, *Notices et Extraits de quelques Manuscrits*, VI. 241). Caesar of Heisterbach (ed. Strange, I. 298) and Guillaume le Breton (*Philippide*, I. 418 ff.) use similar phrases. So also Jean de Garlande, *De Triumphis Ecclesiae*, ed. Wright, 79:

De morte hereticorum mala.
Excrecit fatua ficus, ficulnea mundi
Quam paris, hanc urit flamma, gehenna cremat.
Latrantes et aves direpta cadavera rostris
Asportant, animas nigra caterva legit.

² On the penances of the inquisition see Lea, I., ch. 12; Tanon, 479 ff. Besides the texts there cited see Lea, *Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary*, 50-60; and the manual of procedure prepared by the Archbishop of Tarragona in consultation with the papal penitentiary, Raymond de Peñafoit published by Douais in the *Moyen Age*, second series, III. 305-325.

³ For an early instance of close confinement see the bull of Gregory IX. to the Abbot of La Cava, March 4, 1231, Auvray, 562.

⁴ The undated bull of Gregory IX. to this effect which was inserted in the canon law (c. I. in Sexto, V. 2) was probably called forth by some case in northern France in this period, since it is addressed to the Archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans and since its omission from the Decretals indicates that it was issued after their publication in September, 1234. There are earlier bulls to the same effect addressed to the bishop of Strassburg, October 19, 1232 (Auvray, 933; Rodenberg, *Epistolae*, I. No. 485), to the Archbishop of Bremen, November 12, 1232 (Potthast, 9042), to the Archbishop of Salzburg, November 22, 1232 (Winkelmann, *Acta Imperii Inedita*, I. 504; Potthast, 9046), and to the prelates of southern France, April 19, 1233 (MS. Doat XXXI. 19; Potthast, 9356). Cf. also Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, V. 61, note 1.

flames, many he handed over to perpetual prison," says one chronicler.¹ Another states the distinction more exactly: "Some were shut up in prison to do penance, others who refused to renounce their heresies were consumed by fire."² Burial alive is mentioned by one chronicler,³ but in the account of the persecutions in the north, where fifty met their death, at Châlons, and at Mont-Aimé, it is expressly stated that the heretics were burnt. We have specific mention of the use of imprisonment as a penalty at Douai, in the region of Lille,⁴ and at Cambrai, where the number left in prison, variously stated at eighteen and twenty-one, was almost exactly equal to the number burnt.⁵ The *poena confusibilis* also appears at Cambrai, where three women were "marked," and at Douai, where the penitents were shaved and sentenced to wear crosses.⁶ At La Charité one of the first results of Robert's preaching was the great number of people who appeared voluntarily before him for penance, having already placed wooden collars about their necks.⁷ Of the less rigorous forms of penance few examples have been preserved. There is an instance of exile to Constantinople,⁸ and one man who had made voluntary confession was ordered to take the cross and accompany Simon de Montfort to the east, as well as to attend divine service whenever opportunity offered and to lay aside linen and fast every Friday for the rest of his life.⁹ At La Charité Robert, besides prescribing religious observances of this character, publicly forbade penitents to carry arms or take usury or go into Lombardy, under pain of being condemned as heretics.¹⁰

The practice of the inquisition in northern France also illustrates certain of the secondary consequences of conviction for heresy—civil and ecclesiastical disabilities, destruction of houses, and con-

¹ M. G. H. SS. VI. 440; XXVI. 215.

² *Ib.*, XXVI. 522.

³ *Ib.*, XXVIII. 133. Frederichs seeks to interpret the words "vivos sepeliri" as merely a slightly exaggerated way of describing the close imprisonment of heretics, but Tanon has shown that burying alive was not an unknown form of punishment in the thirteenth century. *Tribunaux de l'Inquisition*, 117; *Histoire des Justices des Anciennes Eglises . . . de Paris*, 29-33; (for an instance of its employment to punish unnatural vice see Lea, *Formulary*, XVI.). It should be observed that the totals would be far too small if the imprisoned were reckoned in.

⁴ Mousket, vv. 28986, 29006.

⁵ *Ib.*, 28966; Albericus, in M. G. H. SS. XXIII. 937.

⁶ Mousket, 28964, 28984, 28985.

⁷ Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 90.

⁸ Mousket, vv. 29002, 29003.

⁹ Lea, *Formulary*, XXXV. 2; MS. Tours 594, f. 29 v, No. 142. For a similar penance imposed by the bishop of Troyes, see Lea, XXXVII. 2 (where the rubric should read "crimine" instead of "elemosine"): MS. Tours 594, f. 30, No. 146.

¹⁰ Bull *Constitutus*, in Chapotin, 224.

fiscation of property. The papal statutes of 1231 excluded the sons and grandsons of heretics from holding ecclesiastical offices or benefices,¹ but in a case from the diocese of Tournai it was held that this provision was not retroactive,² and dispensations from the disability might be granted.³ It was a further principle of the legislation against heresy that the houses of heretics should be destroyed and their sites remain deserted, but as this seriously diminished the profits arising from the confiscation of heretics' property, it was not rigidly enforced.⁴ The forfeiture of the property of heretics, inherited from the Roman law of lese-majesty, had been accepted as a principle by the church as early as the time of Innocent III. Conviction of heresy regularly carried with it confiscation, the property becoming at once subject to seizure by the secular power.⁵ The various applications of this principle, which presented a constant temptation to the cupidity of princes and was ultimately made to furnish the means for the support of the inquisition itself, it is not necessary to follow out here. In France confiscation is decreed against the heretics of the south by the legislation of Louis VIII. and Louis IX.,⁶ and while no similar ordinance has been preserved for the northern portion of the kingdom, the customary law of this region explicitly states that the property of the condemned heretic goes to his lord.⁷ The heirs of the heretic lost all share in his estate, but both king and pope sought to protect the dower rights of orthodox wives,⁸ and there exists, from Friar Robert's time, a decision of the king's court regulating the respec-

¹ Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 79. The statutes mention other disabilities as well.

² Lea, *Formulary*, XLI; MS. Tours 594, f. 31, No. 151. On the date cf. Fredericq, *Corpus*, II. No. 21.

³ Case of a monk of La Charité in Lea, *Formulary*, XL., where the address should begin, "De Caritate priori"; MS. Tours 594, f. 31, No. 150.

⁴ See in general Lea, I. 481-483; Tanon, 519-523. Douais, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for October, 1881, p. 411, cites an order of 1329 for the destruction of houses at Carcassonne (*Cabinet Historique*, XI. 163) as "the first, and perhaps the only, sentence of the sort"; but as early as 1255 Alexander IV. had permitted the prior and convent of La Charité, as temporal lords of the town, to rebuild houses which had been destroyed by order of papal inquisitors. Bourel de la Roncière, *Régestes d'Alexandre IV.*, No. 817.

⁵ On confiscation see Lea, I. ch. xiii.; Tanon, 523 ff.; and the references in Henner, *Ketzgergerichte*, 232.

⁶ *Ordonnances des Rois*, XII. 319; I. 50.

⁷ *Livre de Justice et Plet*, 12; *Établissements de Saint-Louis* (ed. Viollet, II. 147, III. 50; Beaumanoir, ed. Salmon, §833.

⁸ Ordinance of 1259 in the new *Histoire de Languedoc*, VIII. 1441, and *Ordonnances des Rois* I. 63. Bull of Gregory IX. of 1238 cited in Tanon, 532; Innocent IV. in c. 14 in Sexto, V. 2. In 1269 the dower of the widow of a certain "Henricus Bougrius" was charged against the royal treasury (roll of the *bailliage* of Amiens, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXVIII. 621). For definition of the conditions under which the wife might claim, see *Livre de Justice et Plet*, 13, and cf. Beugnot, *Olim*, I. 579.

tive rights of wife and lord.¹ That the king derived pecuniary profit from the property of heretics in northern France is shown by entries in the royal accounts of the period,² but the sums there collected were paltry enough in comparison with the proceeds of confiscation in Languedoc.³

Any consideration of the relation of the secular power to the inquisition in northern France must necessarily be brief because of the scarcity of information. Louis IX., as would be expected in the case of a sovereign of such piety and zeal for the Christian faith, was a declared enemy of heretics, considering it a king's duty to expel them from his kingdom,⁴ and even declaring that a knight ought to kill with his own sword any one whom he knew to be an unbeliever.⁵ He was moreover a staunch friend of the Mendicant Orders, by whom he had been educated,⁶ and not only showed special favor to the inquisitors who came to him on the business of their office,⁷ but gave to the inquisition the firm support of the royal administration. If we may judge from the ordinances issued for the southern portions of his kingdom, the king's officials were ordered to give active assistance by hunting out heretics and bringing them before the proper ecclesiastical authorities, and by executing promptly the

¹ Li jugement des Bougres qui furent ars au tans frere Robert. Si fu teus fais en le cort le Roy Loeys de France que tout li Arctage ki viennent naissant de par le Bougre qui est jugé a ardoir vif doivent demourer quitement au Seigneur dont il muet, sauf cou que li feme de ce Bougre si a sen douaire tant quele vit, et après se mort revient au Seigneur dont il muet [sauf cou que li feme de ce bougre si a sen douaire tant quele vit, et après se mort revient au Seigneur] perpetuellement; et en tous les aquests kil ont acquis ensanle li feme et si oirs en ont la moitié, et li sires lautre moitié, et en cele moitié doit li feme avoir sen Douaire tant quele vit, et après sen décès doit venir au Seigneur dont li victages [arctages?] muet. *Livre Rouge de Saint-Vaast*, f. 157 of the modern copy in the Archives du Pas-de-Calais at Arras (H. 2).

² H. F. XXI. 237, 252. Cf. the *Annals of S. Medard*, M. G. H. SS. XXVI. 522.

Among the others who benefited by confiscations in the north we find the Count of Champagne (see the documents on Gile printed on p. 455, where the count's right is disputed by the collegiate church of St. Quiriace at Provins), and the prior of La Charité as temporal lord of the town (Bourel de la Roncière, *Règistes d'Alexandre IV*, 871). On the practice in the case of condemned ecclesiastics there is little evidence in the early period; the only case I have found in the north is in the diocese of Noyon, where the bishop took the horse and perhaps other personal effects of the accused (Auvray, 2854).

³ See Douais, *Documents*, ccxv, ccxxvii. An example of the sums which confiscation might yield is afforded by the inventory of the property of certain heretics of the south in 1261, which gave a net return of 1413 livres 9 s. 10 d. to the treasury. "Bona Petri Bermundi" Archives Nationales, J. 306,85, to be published in part in the fourth volume of the *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes*.

⁴ Instructions to his son, edited by de Wailly in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXXIII. 440, c. 32; Joinville, ed. de Wailly (1868), 265; Guillaume de S. Pathus (ed. Delaborde), 26.

⁵ Joinville, 19; Guillaume de S. Pathus, 25.

⁶ See the biographies of St. Louis and the royal accounts, *passim*, and cf. Danzas, *Études sur les Temps Primitifs de l'Ordre de S. Dominique*, III. 408 ff.; and Chapotin, *Dominicains de la Province de France*, 494 ff.

⁷ Guillaume de Chartres, in H. F. XX. 33.

sentences pronounced against them, while a reward was promised to any who assisted in the capture of heretics and those who attempted to shield or harbor them were threatened with confiscation of goods and civil disabilities.¹ In 1233 the cause of the inquisition at La Charité was especially commended to the favor of St. Louis by the Pope,² and the labors of Friar Robert there and elsewhere were performed with the King's aid and under his authority.³ The King's officers carry out the friar's sentences, the King's soldiers accompany him as a guard,⁴ the King and Queen themselves take a personal, and it must be said a merciful, interest in his proceedings and the fate of his victims.⁵ There is no record that the sovereign attended in person any of the executions for heresy, but there is mention of the presence of certain of the great feudatories, Countess Jeanne of Flanders at Douai, and Thibaut IV. of Champagne at Mont-Aimé.⁶ After Friar Robert's fall the same policy seems to have continued. In the accounts of the year 1248 the expenses of friars inquisitors are charged against the royal treasury at several places in the north,⁷ and at various times we find the cost of the imprisonment and execution of heretics defrayed by the King's agents⁸; while it was at the King's special request that Alexander IV. gave more effective organization to the French inquisition in 1255.⁹

It is not the purpose of this article to follow the vicissitudes of the

¹ Ordinance for the south, beginning "Cupientes in primis aetatis," *Ordonnances des Rois*, I. 50. A lost ordinance of St. Louis, "Cupientes in favorem," which probably related to the north, is cited by Philip VI. *Ordonnances des Rois* II. 41; cf. Fredericq, *Corpus*, II. Nos. 20, 55; *Geschiedenis*, I. 112. Ordinances of St. Louis concerning heresy and a letter patent directing the "dukes, counts, etc., to aid the inquisitors of heretical pravity," are mentioned in the contents of a lost formulary of the royal chancery, Langlois, *Formulaires de Lettres*, VI. 3, 14, Nos. 1, 318.

² Auvray, 1145.

³ Mousket, vv. 28881, 28882:

Et par la volente dou roi
De France, ki len fist otroi.

Matthew Paris (*Chronica Majora*, III. 520; M. G. H. SS. XXVIII. 146): Ad-jutus brachio saeculari, et domino rege Francorum impendente subsidium.

⁴ Mousket, vv. 28912-28914:

Cil Robiers, o lui siergans vint;
Quar li rois le faisoit conduire,
Pour cou con ne li vosist nuire.

Matthew Paris, *Historia Anglorum*, II. 388: Qui eidem Roberto auxilium praestitit militare. Sbaralea, *Bullarium Franciscanum*, I. 178: Ad locum ipsum manu veniebat armata.

⁵ Mousket, vv. 28899 ff. Cf. Berger, *Blanche de Castille*, 295.

⁶ M. G. H. SS. XXIV. 30; XXIII. 944.

⁷ H. F. XXI. 262, 264, 268, 269, 273, 274, 276, 280, 281. Cf. also the account of Paris for the Ascension term, 1255, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXVIII. 618.

⁸ H. F. XXI. 262, 274, XXII. 570, 745; *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXVIII. 621. Cf. H. F. XXI. 227, 237; Tillemont, *Histoire de S. Louis*, II. 292.

⁹ Bull. *Prae cunctis mentis* of December 13, 1255, Potthast, 16132; Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. No. 132.

inquisition under the successors of Gregory IX. The legislation of Innocent IV. was of great importance in the firm establishment of the inquisition and the development of its procedure, but it is directed primarily against the heretics of Languedoc and Italy, and touches only in the most general way upon conditions in northern France.¹ Alexander IV. devoted more attention to affairs in the north, and to his pontificate belongs the definite organization of the French inquisition under the direction of the Dominican prior provincial at Paris, who finally came to exercise control over the south as well.² "Little remains to us of the organization thus perfected over the wide territory stretching from the Bay of Biscay to the Rhine."³ In 1248 the almost universal silence of the contemporary records is broken by the royal accounts, which reveal heretics in prison at Paris, Sens, and Corbeil, and inquisitors supported by the King in a dozen different districts of northern France.⁴ Three inquisitors are mentioned by name at Paris in 1255⁵; in 1277 and 1278 Simon du Val, "inquisitor in the kingdom of France," was at work at Orleans, at St. Quentin and in Normandy;⁶ and in 1285 Friar Guillaume d'Auxerre appears as inquisitor in Champagne and Brie.⁷ The record of their condemnations has disappeared even more completely than the names of the inquisitors. A woman burnt at Pontoise in 1261, presumably for heresy,⁸ a payment of dower to a heretic's widow in 1269,⁹ a conflict of jurisdiction in 1272 between the bishop of Auxerre and the prior of La Charité¹⁰—such are the scattered notices of the victims of the French inquisition in the later thirteenth century. "The laborers were vigorous, and labored according to the light which was in them," concludes Mr. Lea, "but the men and their acts are buried beneath the dust of the forgotten past. That they did their duty is visible in the fact that heresy makes so little figure in France, and that the slow but remorseless extermination of Catharism in Languedoc was not accompanied by its perpetuation in the north."¹¹ CHARLES H. HASKINS.

¹ See for Languedoc, Douais, *Documents*, xiii-xxii; for Italy, the bulls of 1254 in Berger, *Régestes d'Innocent IV.*, 7790-7802, 8310-8313.

² Fredericq, *Corpus*, I. Nos. 130 ff.; Douais, *Documents*, xxii-xxv; Lea, II. 119; and particularly the excellent account in Fredericq, *Geschiedenis*, I. ch. 5, where the papal legislation affecting the inquisition in the north is followed through to the time of Boniface VIII.

³ Lea, II. 120.

⁴ H. F. XXI. 262, 264, 268, 269, 273, 274, 276, 280, 281.

⁵ Royal account, in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXVIII. 618.

⁶ Martène and Durand *Thesaurus*, V. 1810-1813; Lea, II. 120; Fredericq, *Geschiedenis*, I. 60-63; Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant*, CCLXIII.

⁷ Lea, II. 121, citing MS. Doat, XXXII. 127.

⁸ H. F. XXII. 745 A.

⁹ *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, XXVIII. 621.

¹⁰ *Gallia Christiana*, XII. Instr., 173.

¹¹ Lea, II. 120.

EUROPEAN ARCHIVES¹

I AM asked to tell you something about European archives—a vast subject for a twenty-minute talk. What I know about European archives is a much smaller theme; yet even that will bear cutting. Precluded from the outset is the method of that masterly study in which a half dozen years ago an American scholar gave to the world its best account of the archives of the Vatican.² May we have more such papers. But such must deal with European archives singly. Be it mine in homelier fashion to acquaint you with them all. So broad a treatment must begin with the rudiments. Will you pardon me, then, if, forgetting the riper scholars before me, I address myself for a little to those who know of the archives of Europe no more than did I not so very long ago?

First of all: Archives are *not* to manuscripts—as I, at least, once supposed—what libraries are to printed books. Book manuscripts—chronicles, journals, all that has literary form or substance—belong, like printed books, to libraries. In archives seek only documents, *i. e.*, official and legal papers: edicts, treaties, charters, writs, wills, deeds, minutes, registers, yes and official correspondence. But not all documents. Look not there for those of current history. Such cannot yet leave the keeping of their authors or owners. Only when the transactions they record are closed, and the secrets they contain can safely be shared, will they be merged in the archives. The depositories in which they meanwhile rest—if they belong to the bureaus of a government—are technically known as *registratures*, and are not open to the public. Thus, in England, diplomatic correspondence prior to 1850 may be sought in the national archives—the Public Record Office; but only that previous to 1760 may be seen without special permission from His Majesty's Secretary of State, while all that of later date than 1850 remains still in the jealous custody of the Foreign Office. So, in France, the hesitant ministry of Foreign Affairs at last lays freely before the public (though in its own archives) all antedating

¹A paper read at the meeting of the American Historical Association (December, 1901). Despite its somewhat colloquial form, I have preferred to print it (save for one or two minute corrections) precisely as delivered, adding only a few foot-notes to indicate its printed sources or to suggest where further information may be found.

²The allusion is, of course, to Professor Haskins, whose study on *The Vatican Archives* was printed in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW for October, 1896.

September 14, 1791, and with restrictions all to May 30, 1814; but nothing later. In Italy they will show you documents to 1815; in Holland to 1813; in Denmark only to 1750.¹

Not the newest documents, then, are in the archives. But not the oldest either. Archives there have been, indeed, almost from the dawn of history. Egyptians, Assyrians, Medes, Hebrews, Phœnicians, Greeks, Romans, all, as we know, had their documents and their depositories for them—temple or palace or archive building; but all these archives were long ago ruined or scattered. Such remnants as are ours must be sought in libraries or in museums. To modern archives they have left nothing but their name and the fruitful tradition of their methods. The new Germanic kingdoms of the west, Goth and Lombard and Frank, Meroving and Karling, had too their archives, aping in such crude fashion as they could their Roman models; but these are likewise gone without a trace, a prey to inroad and to feudal chaos. If to-day in the museum-room of the French national archives there are displayed with pride the papyrus charters of Merovingian kings, it is not that there they were preserved. They owe their safety to quite another asylum.²

For, happily, one place of refuge baffled even the fury and the neglect of the Dark Ages. It was to church and to abbey that even secular princes turned for the shelter of their records; and all that is left us of the documents of the earlier medieval centuries we owe to them. The oldest archives of Europe are those of the Church, and the oldest of all those of the bishops of Rome. From the fourth century, at least, their existence is certain. Yet even here, as Professor Haskins has told us, what is left from the early Middle Ages is only a gleaning. The extant continuous records begin only with Pope Innocent III., at the end of the twelfth century. If this be true of Rome, how much more of the lesser centers of ecclesiastical life. For centuries almost nothing is left us save title-deeds to property—the record of pious donations and of the prayers which were their meed—with here and there perhaps a scrap of ecclesiastical legislation.

¹ Yet it is rash to name these limits positively. With the bettering of good faith in international intercourse and with the growing conviction that the truth is less damaging than the suspicions bred by concealment, these restrictions are constantly being cut down. The statement as to England, corrected from my address as delivered, I have from the Record Office itself, under date of April 28, 1902. For the permission of the Secretary of State any other than British subjects must apply through their diplomatic representative.

² For the following sketch of the rise of European archives I am especially indebted to Franz von Löhner's *Archivlehre* (Paderborn, 1890), to H. Bresslau's *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien*, I (Leipzig, 1889), and to the excellent article on "Archives" by Arthur Giry in the *Grande Encyclopédie*.

Civil archives passed out of thought. The Holy Roman Empire itself, in spite of imperial traditions and of the pattern of her papal rival, was for centuries content with such store of public records as her migrant emperors and their clerkly chancellors could drag with them from place to place. Of "archives of the Empire," there begins to be mention just at the middle of the twelfth century,¹ but the phrase is puzzling, and, according to our best authority on imperial diplomatics, it was not till when, a half century later, the Hohenstaufen princes learned in their new Sicilian realm that business-like administration which Norman had there been taught by Saracen, that they first brought system into the custody of the imperial documents.² Yet rude enough it must still have been, for when, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Emperor Henry VII. made his fatal coronation-journey into Italy, the archives not only journeyed with him, but, left stranded there by his death, may still be found, in great part, at Pisa and Turin.³ Nor is there reason, from what is left, to suppose that they contained aught older than the just preceding days of Rudolf of Habsburg. It was a century later when, under Kaiser Sigismund, it was at last established that an Emperor's archives pass to his successor in office, even when not his heir by blood; and only from the year 1422 can one speak of the archives of the Empire as a stable institution. As a *group* of institutions let me rather say; for, though the Imperial Court-Archives (*Reichshofarchiv*) came to rest with the Habsburgs at Vienna, one must almost to our day seek those of the Archchancery (*Reichskanzlei*), at Mainz, those of the Supreme Court of Justice (*Reichskammergericht*), at Wetzlar, those of the Diets at Ratisbon; and the two last-named collections are still at large.⁴

Ambulant, too, till late in the twelfth century were whatever of archives belonged to the kings of France. It was only when, in 1194, at Fréteval, Philip Augustus had the chagrin to leave his archives, with the rest of his baggage, in the victorious hands of Richard of England, that he had the good sense to quit the itinerant system and to establish at Paris that *Trésor des Chartes*, out of which

¹"*In archivis imperii*," 1146. See Bresslau, I. pp. 134-137. Cf. also F. v. Löher, *Archivlehre*, pp. 58-61.

²Bresslau, I. p. 135.

³Löher, p. 94; Bresslau, pp. 140-142.

⁴Those of the *Reichskanzlei* are now for the most part at Vienna. Of those of the *Reichskammergericht* only so much as relates to the old Empire in general, to the lands now Prussian, and to the lost outlying provinces (like Switzerland and the Low Countries) still remains at Wetzlar; what concerned the other German states or their citizens has since 1845 been distributed to their local archives. See Löher, pp. 187, 196.

have grown in our day the French national archives. True, for two or three centuries prior to the Revolution it received almost no accessions, the ministers of the state seeming to count the official papers of their bureaux as private property, to be dispersed or appropriated at their pleasure; but when, with the Revolution, there fell both the Old Régime and the Church, there could be drawn together at Paris from all France, not only such administrative and judicial papers as had survived, but almost all the ecclesiastical and baronial archives of the realm. It is this mass, or rather so much of it as was spared by the Revolutionary vandalism and by the sifting prescribed by the Convention, which, now merged with the ancient archives of the crown, forms the wealth of the Archives Nationales.¹

And even the public records of England, which in age as in fullness surpass all others in Europe, begin but a little earlier. They too date, in orderly sequence, only from the early twelfth century.²

But the example thus set by the greatest secular authorities was eagerly followed by the lesser. The Bavarian archives, to-day the oldest and richest in Germany, were in order before the Empire's.³ In the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries not only all leading governments and princely houses, but even the pettier feudal lords and the rising towns as well, had begun to hoard their records; and by the fourteenth even the burgher families and the notaries had caught the infection. From this time forth, archives multiplied apace, and slowly took on system and thoroughness. The scribbling sixteenth century brought them to their full activity, which not even the turmoil and ravage of the seventeenth could seriously interrupt. In 1770 there are known to have been, in Paris alone, no less than 405 treasuries of archives; and the number in all France at the end of the ancient régime is reckoned by Arthur Giry at more than 10,000.⁴ Nor is there reason to suppose that the rest of Europe fell behind.

It was the task of the nineteenth century, with its absorption of small states, its secularization of convents, its apotheosis of nationality, its scientific spirit, to gather into great central archives this wealth of documents and to make it accessible to historians. Yet

¹ For all this see H. Bordier, *Les Archives de la France* (Paris, 1855), and for an admirable briefer sketch, brought down to the present, Giry's article "Archives" in the *Grande Encyclopédie*.

² S. R. Scargill-Bird, *Guide to the Documents in the Public Record Office* (London, 1891), p. iii.

³ Their beginnings, or at least the beginnings of their consecutive contents, belong to the early thirteenth century (Bresslau, p. 149). January 1204 is the date of the first document of the *Monumenta Wettelsbacensia*.

⁴ *Grande Encyclopédie*, article "Archives."

neither the one nor the other has been accomplished to such an extent as is often supposed. The great attempt of Napoleon, in 1810, to centralize at Paris all the archives of Europe was brought to naught, in 1814, by that dreamer's fall; and the thousands of wagon-loads which had come trundling over Pyrenees and Alps and Rhine, from Simancas, from Turin, from Rome, from Vienna, from Holland, went trundling back again, not without some dropping of their treasures in the mud.¹ In most European lands not even the archives of the state, though now for the most part under a single control, are gathered into a single repository. Even in England it is only within the last half century that the public records as a whole have been put in the care of the national archivist—quaintly called the Master of the Rolls—and their more important deposits drawn together within the spacious halls of the new Record Office. Of the almost countless lesser collections there is not yet even an inventory, save as one can glean it from the reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.

In Prussia, and yet more in Austro-Hungary, the several provincial archives maintain their integrity against those of the dynastic capital. Even in Bavaria, it is only the documents of earlier date than the fifteenth century that are centralized at Munich; though the admirable system by which papers may be transferred at wish between the provincial archives and the capital makes this scarcely a hindrance to research. And if, in the Netherlands, the Rijksarchief at the Hague has, to the great convenience of American scholars, succeeded in adding to its other wealth the vast commercial records of the two great trading corporations—the Dutch East India Company and the Dutch West India Company—which so long shaped or shared the fortunes of Orient and Occident (nay, has now at last drawn into the same complex of buildings the rich private archives of the House of Orange), in Spain, not less important to the transatlantic student, not only do the archives of Aragon and of Navarre remain at Barcelona or at Pampeluna, but those of

¹ A classed table of these foreign archives gathered at Paris by Napoleon is printed at the end of H. Bordier's *Les Archives de la France* (Paris, 1855). Interesting details both as to the seizure and as to the return of the German archives may be found in an article by H. Schlitter on "Die Zurückstellung der von den Franzosen im Jahre 1809 aus Wien entführten Archive, Bibliotheken und Kunstsammlungen," in the *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* for 1901 (Bd. XXII., pp. 108-122). I have in my keeping, at Cornell University, a manuscript which is known to have belonged to the library of a famous German city at the end of the eighteenth century, and which probably, carried off by the French, fell into the mud from their overloaded wagons, as others are known to have done. Such, at least, is the conjecture of the present librarian-archivist of the town; and it squares well with the appearance of the manuscript and with all I know of its history.

Castile (whose alone was the monopoly of the Indies) are divided between Simancas and Alcalá, while at Seville, so long the one port of entry for the Indian trade, are still the archives of the Indies, and at Madrid the deposits of more modern bureaux, such as the (to us) important Hydrographic Depository. As for the lesser archives throughout Europe—archives of towns, families, corporations, churches, orders, individuals—they are, of course, still legion.¹

It had been my thought to tell you something in detail of the contents and organization of at least two or three of the great national archives. But my time is already waning; and, without so much as a glance at the literature of the subject,² let me rather offer you a few suggestions as to how European archives may be used.³ There are at least four ways: 1. One may go to the archives in person. To the student of leisure and training this is doubtless the most tempting course: but it has its own difficulties and drawbacks. One needs, in the first place, or may need, an introduction. Let

¹The best idea of their multiplicity and variety may perhaps be gained from the book of Langlois and Stein, *Les Archives de l'Histoire de France* (Paris, 1891). This work, though it seeks only to point out in what collections, in France or abroad, material may be found for the study of the history of France, is at present the best guide to the archives of Europe as a whole. It even has something to tell of those of Africa, Asia, America, and the Indies. To the archives of German lands (not only the German Empire, but Austria-Hungary, Switzerland, Luxemburg, and the Baltic Provinces as well) C. A. H. Burkhardt's *Hand- und Adressbuch der deutschen Archive* (2d ed., Leipzig, 1887), though its descriptive notes are of the briefest, is a useful directory. Excellent brief surveys of the archives of Spain, of Holland, of Sweden, of Roumania, are to be found in the too short-lived *Revue Internationale des Archives* (Paris, 1895-1896). Suggestion of further literature may be sought in Giry's *Manuel de Diplomatique* (Paris, 1894), pp. 37-40, and at the end of his article in the *Grande Encyclopédie*; and especially in the article on "La Science des Archives," prefaced by Langlois to the *Revue Internationale des Archives*, just mentioned. For Great Britain, for Russia for Italy, for Spain, for Belgium, there is nowhere accessible so much as a complete list of the archives. Of high value, however, for British archives are of course the reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commissions.

²I may be allowed to mention in a foot-note that of the contents of the Archives Nationales of France there is a good single-volume printed inventory, the *État Sommaire par Séries des Documents Conservés aux Archives Nationales* (Paris, 1891). To these, too, the book of Bordier is mainly devoted, and there is an excellent brief analysis in Giry's article in the *Grande Encyclopédie*. To the wealth of the English Public Record Office the best key is now the *Guide* of Scargill-Bird (London, 1891). Here is hardly the place to mention the great series of *Calendars of State Papers*, through which such vast bodies of documents in English archives and of documents in foreign archives bearing on English history are becoming accessible to scholars. On the archives of Venice, so important for all Europe during the earlier modern centuries, we have the entertaining volume of A. Baschet, *Les Archives de Venise* (Paris, 1870). For the Vatican archives let me again point out the worth of Professor Haskins's study.

³For help in their use there are many handbooks, such as, for England, R. Sims's *Manual for the Genealogist, Topographer, Antiquary, and Legal Professor* (new ed., London, 1888), and W. Rye's *Records and Record Searching* (2d ed., London, 1897). I have found especially suggestive the little *Leitfaden für Archivbenutzer* of Dr. Max Bär (Leipzig, 1896).

not the sensitive vanity of the scholar rebel at this. Archives are not libraries. Their volumes have no duplicates, and, once lost, are gone forever. Nowhere is a marauder's task so easy as among their loose papers, and nowhere are his temptations so great—a fortune, a reputation, a policy, may hang on the fate of a single paper. To-day all the public archives of Europe, Constantinople's alone excepted, lie open to the accredited scholar; but very few, like the English Record Office and the French Archives Nationales, admit all comers. One may, of course, introduce oneself, especially if one hold any academic or official station, by writing to the archives beforehand of one's visit; and usually, I think, such a letter will in any case be adequate introduction. Even in the case of open archives, such an advance application is desirable; and by many, as those of Germany, it is strictly required.¹ The materials one wishes to use may be for the moment out of reach or may need hunting up. The archivist or sub-archivist in charge of them may be out of town. The public research-room in most archives is but small, and unannounced guests may embarrass. Write beforehand. I speak with emphasis, for I have myself been a sinner, and have paid the penalty of delay. And in your application state with all the definiteness possible what you wish to investigate, taking care (especially for the German archives) not to make your subject too broad.² Have a care, too, in choosing the time for your visit.

¹ See, for the requirements usual in German archives, Bär, *Leitfaden*, pp. 15-19; Holtzinger, *Katechismus der Registratur- und Archivkunde* (Leipzig, 1883), pp. 130-134. "Archive sind noch immer keine Bibliothek," writes even the helpful Franz von Löher, so long the head of the Bavarian archives; "nicht jedermann erhält Zutritt, sondern nur, wer Vertrauen verdient, und den Arbeiten der Archivbeamten nicht hinderlich fällt. Der echt wissenschaftliche Forscher wird anders bedient, als ein ewig fordernder und fragender Dilettant, und es giebt ein anerkannt ehrenwerter Charakter festere Gewähr gegen Missbrauch, als der erste beste Unbekannte." (*Archivlehre*, p. 260.)

² No matter how well introduced or how specific in one's appeal, one must not be too sure of seeing the documents he seeks. A decade or two ago, while engaged in research in western Germany, I found myself in a Rhenish city, one of the homes of the Prussian archives. It had been suggested to me by the archivist of a neighboring city that I might find here certain papers of value to my quest. I made bold to call upon the archivist, who, receiving me most kindly, told me of documents which might prove of use; but he added that he could lay them before me only when I had gained permission from the Director-General of the Archives, in Berlin—the great historian, Heinrich von Sybel. Happily I was equipped with a personal letter to Dr. von Sybel from his friend and my own, a scholar who had shortly before been our minister at Berlin and who is now again our ambassador at the German court. I enclosed it to him, with my plea, asking to examine any documents which might be found in these provincial archives touching a specified subject. In due time his answer came: a curt half-page informing me that no document on this subject existed in the Prussian archives. Perhaps the great historian felt only contempt for a student still interested in the history of the witch-persecution; perhaps he lacked faith in the seriousness of an American scholar. I think it more likely that I had come up against that principle of German archive-administration which forbids

Many archives, especially the smaller ones and those of the Church, have long and frequent holidays. Thus, at the Vatican, what with Christmas, Carnival, Easter, and the long summer vacation, in addition to the single feast-days, the working days (as Professor Haskins has told us) are less than half those of the year. Remember, too, that the archive working day is short—sometimes only three or four hours. This is the more serious because the use of the archives is not always cost-free.

Only of late years and in the great public archives has it become wholly free; and there are still archives of state, like those of Bavaria and Mecklenburg, where, while no charge is made for research in the interest of science, a fee must be paid for private investigations, like those of the genealogist or the lawyer. Even where no fee is paid, one must not forget that archives are as yet seldom endowed for the public; that the scholar is a guest, entitled only to courtesy; and that for service rendered he owes both gratitude and wherever possible a more substantial recognition. It behooves one, then, to make the most of his archive-time; and all possible should be done beforehand to orient oneself as to one's field of research and as to the resources of the archives. And when at last one is seated at the archive-table, documents before him, his trouble may be but begun. They must be read, analyzed, interpreted. Even the European scripts of our own time are not to be scanned with ease by one who has but read in print the tongues in which they are written; and with every century backward the puzzle grows.¹ True, at one's elbow, in all the greater archives, are trained archivists ready to help with every doubtful reading, obscure allusion, ambiguous date; but they cannot undertake to

to the public all documents touching the good fame of living persons or of their families. Even in Italy, the papers of criminal trials may not be seen till seventy years are gone. Be the explanation what it may, I had opportunity a few months later to learn a differing attitude. Being in Paris, I presented myself at the National Archives, and, with no credential but my visiting card, asked for documents upon the same subject. I was shown into a study room, and they were brought me at once. If the other course was hesitant, surely this was rash. This difference in administrative temper was well pointed out a quarter century ago by the German historian Baumgarten ("Archive und Bibliotheken in Frankreich und Deutschland," in the *Freussische Jahrbücher* for 1875), taking his text from the reply of the great Belgian archivist-in-chief, Gachard, to his question by what steps he could gain access to certain documents in the archives at Brussels: "Tout cela, Monsieur, sera mis à votre disposition sans que vous ayez à faire aucune démarche ni aucune demande: nos Archives sont ouvertes à tout le monde, mais plus particulièrement aux hommes distingués qui veulent venir les consulter dans l'intérêt de travaux historiques." Yet it is precisely the German archives which go furthest in the lending of documents and in their transfer from place to place for the use of scholars.

¹I have seen an American family on its travels present itself at the Dutch archives in search of records of which its members could read neither handwriting nor language.

teach the elements of palæography and diplomatics. With such aids now available in English as Thompson's *Handbook*¹ and Trice Martin's *Record Interpreter*,² no enterprising student need long fear ancient script; and, if he have but French enough for Giry's manual,³ he may soon grapple with charters and chronology. But he must not waste good archive-time in the study. Nor does he need to do so, for

2. One may use the archives by deputy. Of course, the deputy, too, needs accrediting; and, if he prove untrained, he must not hope for the patient help shown to one on his own errand. Why not send one who is trained? Haunting all great archives are experts who live by such research.⁴ Where possible, it is best to let the archivists themselves choose for you. You are in less danger of being victimized by a trickster or an incapable, or of hitting on one who is *persona non grata* among the documents. Best of all is it, in general, if you can win for your task an archivist himself in his off hours.

3. One can use the archives by means of transcripts. Nearly all great archives furnish such on request or are ready to name competent transcribers. One need not tremble for the expense, for in the greater archives it is usually fixed by law and named in their published and posted rules; and it is often astonishingly moderate. Certified transcripts, *i. e.*, those whose accuracy is guaranteed by the seal of the archives and the certificate of the archivist, cost much more; but, save for use as legal evidence in courts of law, they are hardly to be wished. Of course, if one is to order transcripts, one must know precisely what one wants. One may get clues from the earlier scholars who have investigated one's theme. General works, like Oesterley's *Wegweiser*⁵ and the *Archives de l'Histoire de France* of Langlois and Stein, will be of great help within their own fields. Above all, the analyses and inventories of the archives themselves must be ransacked, so far as they can be found in

¹ *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography* (London and New York, 1893), by Edward Maunde Thompson.

² *The Record Interpreter* (London, 1892), by Charles Trice Martin.

³ *Manuel de Diplomatique* (Paris, 1894).

⁴ Walter Rye, in his *Records and Record Searching* (p. 124), names a dozen such at London. At the Hague I found thus constantly busied for English scholars that admirable worker Mr. W. G. Van Oyen. Though now himself an archivist, he has not been too busy to be of much aid to me, and he may be able to attend to the errands of others.

⁵ *Wegweiser durch die Literatur der Urkundensammlungen* (Berlin, 1885-1886), 2 vols. An index by places to all the European documents printed or mentioned by historians. Invaluable, despite very grave incompleteness.

print.¹ And, at the best, one can hardly hope thus to find matter not already familiar to the historians. Yet the greatest of American medievalists, perhaps the most fruitful of living American historians, Mr. Lea, has never worked a day in European archives: all his materials have been transcribed for him.

4. Last and as yet least of all, one may use the archives by loan. Save in Germany, where scholars are sometimes allowed great privileges of this sort, one must be a great personage indeed to have archive-documents intrusted to one's own custody; and, remembering such mishaps as the burning of Mommsen's library, we may all well hope that the exceptions may be few. But the lending from archives to archives for the more convenient use of scholars, even as now in America we lend from library to library, is more common. I have spoken of this use among the Bavarian archives; and the Prussian are yet more generous, not restricting this courtesy to those of Prussia. In France the plan has at least been suggested.² Of its use in other lands I know little. However it grow, such treasures are hardly likely to cross the Atlantic.

In conclusion I have only to add that even from that period, from the twelfth century to the eighteenth, where European archives are of most value to historians, great bodies of documents may also be found in the libraries.

GEORGE LINCOLN BURR.

¹In the German archives one may not hope to see a catalogue, not even a manuscript one. "Die Vorlegung der Repertorien des Archivs," runs the Prussian statute, "findet ausseramtlich niemals und an niemand statt." "The reason for this," explains Franz von Löher (p. 275), "is that the catalogues are the keys to the archives, and as long as archive-secrecy exists, so long must it especially include the catalogues." So much the more must the searcher know beforehand what to seek.

²By Langlois, in the *Archives de l'Histoire de France* (p. xvi, note), and in the *Revue Internationale des Archives* (p. 16).

THE PLACE OF NATHANIEL MACON IN SOUTHERN HISTORY

MANY who are well acquainted with Southern history are almost entirely unfamiliar with the historical character of Nathaniel Macon. He is often mentioned by the best of authors as a North Carolinian, as a Georgian, or simply as a Southern Democrat. His share in the political development of the South is but vaguely known, yet every southern state has either a town or a county, or both, called by his name. The reason of his passing so entirely out of the minds of men is twofold: first, Southerners have not been students of history; second, Macon himself ordered all his papers burned before his death. The somewhat erratic old leader was determined to cover up his tracks, and he very nearly succeeded.¹

Nathaniel Macon was born at the "Macon manor," in Warren county, North Carolina, December 17, 1758. He was descended from a Huguenot family which had been ennobled, we are told, in 1321. A branch of the family came to America in 1680, settled near Middle Plantation in Virginia and was soon reckoned among the first families of the province.² In the early thirties Nathaniel's father emigrated to North Carolina and before 1760 he had become one of the wealthiest men in the "Southside of Roanoke." The elder Macon was to upper North Carolina what the elder Jefferson was to northern Virginia—subduer of the forest and Indian fighter, a sort of *Markgraf*, ready always for an arduous undertaking. Young Macon, like young Jefferson, was left an orphan at a tender age and with a fair fortune. He was sent to Princeton, where so many young Southerners were then preparing themselves for the coming crisis. At college Macon "served a tour" in the Revolu-

¹The sources from which we draw some information concerning him are: the *Annals of Congress*; the Jefferson manuscripts in the State Department at Washington; the Joseph H. Nicholson papers, now in the possession of Judge Hagner, of Washington; the Bartlett Vancey and the John Steele manuscripts at the University of North Carolina; and a small remnant of the original Macon papers which were preserved by his grandson, William Eaton, of Warrenton, North Carolina, and are now in the possession of Mrs. Walter K. Martin, of Richmond, Virginia. This last named collection contains remnants of a correspondence with Jefferson, Gallatin, John Randolph, and Andrew Jackson, remnants which cause the student of our early national history the greater regret that the main body of the papers was allowed to be destroyed.

²Meade's *Old Churches*, I. 387; *William and Mary College Quarterly* (July, 1897).

tionary army, but he returned in the autumn of 1776 to North Carolina, where he occupied himself for three years in the study of law and history. Two days before the fall of Charleston he joined a company of volunteers from Warren county and was elected a lieutenant; he declined the honor, however, preferring to serve as a private. His company was at Camden, and was one of the few companies which maintained a show of order and appeared ready for service on the Yadkin a few days later. From February, 1781, to December, 1785, Macon was in the state legislature as Senator from Warren; he was identified with the Willie Jones democracy as against the aristocratic party of the east under Johnston, Hooper and Iredell; in 1786 he was elected a delegate to the Continental Congress and was "ordered" to New York by the governor,¹ but like Willie Jones in this, he disobeyed the order—he was opposed to the sending of delegates by the state to the old Congress. The new national Constitution met his determined opposition; yet in 1791 he appeared in Philadelphia as a member of the House of Representatives from North Carolina, where he remained without interruption until 1815, when he was transferred to the Senate. No one ever attempted to defeat his election to the Senate, and he therefore remained in office until he retired of his own accord, nominating his successor. From 1828 to 1837 he lived in secluded retirement on his plantation twelve miles north of Warrenton and two miles south of the Roanoke. In 1835 he served as chairman of the convention which gave North Carolina its second constitution. One year later he manifested great interest in the election of the Van Buren ticket and rejoiced in the triumph of his candidate. He died June 28, 1837, and was buried on the most barren hilltop of his large plantation. A huge pile of flint rock, surrounded by scrubby post oaks, now marks the spot.

Such is a brief outline of Macon's public life. I wish now to point out the political policies of his career and his influence in getting these policies incorporated into the political creed of the South.

When the Revolution drew to a close the prominent leaders of the old régime in North Carolina began to assert themselves again in state politics. They had been excluded from active participation in public affairs by two considerations: (1) a too zealous interest in the American cause would in case of ultimate defeat bring utter ruin upon them and their families; (2) the radicals, sansculottes as they were later called, were in the saddle and looked askance at the wealthy conservatives who were constantly decrying all repub-

¹ *Journals of N. C. Assembly*, 1786; *State Records*, Vol. XVIII. p. 108.

lican forms of government and especially the more democratic. The leaders of the conservatives when their organized efforts began to be felt a second time were Johnston and Hooper, already referred to, both of whom were closely connected with prominent royalists.¹ The leader of the radicals and the virtual dictator of the state was Willie Jones, a wealthy planter who lived like a prince but who talked and voted like a Jacobin. Those that had stood aloof from the Revolution, merchants of the eastern towns and many of the Tories, joined the conservatives in 1782-1785, and these elements forming a compact and powerful party were desirous of substituting a strong national government for the old royal régime, an idea which gave promise of some check to the power of the state which was then in the hands of their political opponents. The exiles or émigrés naturally looked to these Nationals for protection against the angry state leaders, and with the promise of such aid, they came back to their estates. The Radicals—Whigs, as Macon always insisted on calling them—were determined that the lukewarm leaders of the Revolution and their new allies, the Tories, should not acquire the ascendancy. A harsh confiscation law was directed against all who had taken any part in the British cause or whose conduct during the war had been open to serious question. And since the entire machinery of the state government was in the control of the latter party it was but natural that they should continue to exalt the state and decry every attempt of their opponents to form a "more permanent union of all the states." The state was the creation of the Whigs; its enemies or detractors were little better to them than the Tories themselves.

Such was the division of parties in North Carolina and generally in the south, when Macon entered the legislature in 1781. He was by nature a radical: he joined the Jones party of which his brother was already a prominent leader. It was a sort of Virginian party after the Jefferson pattern of 1776; Jones and the Macons were themselves practically Virginians. They had given North Carolina a constitution in 1776 modeled after their mother state. Reform, democracy of the simplest type, were the ideas for which they stood. A most commendable item of their creed in this chaotic time was that which demanded a sound financial system based on gold and silver.² This they could not carry into effect; but their earnest efforts did them great honor. It was a part of their scheme of state organization, and along with it they advocated

¹ Hooper-Maclaine correspondence, *North Carolina State Records*, XVI. 932-1000.

² *Journals of North Carolina Assembly*, 1781-1785. The plan constantly appears.

protective tariff, public improvements, encouragement of foreign trade and intercourse and a better system of public education. The celebrated American policy of a later day was thus early put forward in North Carolina. In this school Macon served his apprenticeship and then retired at the age of twenty-seven to his new-made home near the Roanoke to observe the course of events. A call from this retirement to serve the state in the Continental Congress was not heeded, as has been seen. When the new Constitution was presented to North Carolina, he exerted himself to the utmost to defeat it. Its greatest opponents, Willie Jones and Thomas Person, were his friends and neighbors. All upper North Carolina, like all lower Virginia, was violently opposed to any plan of national union; the country which furnished the Revolution the greatest number of troops relative to population, and in which, it was boasted, scarce a single Tory lived, was in 1788 most determined in its opposition to all forms of nationalism. The whole broad area from Richmond to Raleigh and from Norfolk to Patrick Henry's new home beyond Danville was staunchly Anti-federalist. Its older leaders were Henry and Jones; its younger, Macon and John Randolph.

But when the Constitution was finally adopted, Macon re-entered politics and was among the first advocates of strict construction of the "contract" among the states. He soon became its champion, and it became to him a sort of fetich. The integrity of the state depended on the most rigid adherence to the letter of that instrument. In 1796-1798 he advocated increasing the militia of the states whenever the Federalists proposed increasing the army; the militia then and in 1807 was his sole dependence for national defense; its re-organization and complete equipment were perpetual themes with him. The principal charge of inconsistency ever brought against him was that of 1807-1808, when in the face of war with England he voted for an increase of six thousand men for the United States army.¹ He opposed the Sedition Bill chiefly on the ground that it would encroach on the prerogative of the state. "Let the States," said he, "continue to punish when necessary licentiousness of the press; how is it come to pass that Congress should now conceive that they have power to pass laws on this subject? This Government depends upon the State Legislatures for existence. They have only to refuse to elect Senators in Congress and all is gone."² The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions expressed his view entirely and he gave them his hearty support in North Caro-

¹ *Annals of Cong.*, 8th Cong., January-February.

² *Annals of Cong.*, 5th Cong., 2151-2152.

lina though the legislature contemptuously voted them under the table. But the Federalists were then in control.

When Macon became Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress as a result of Jefferson's elevation to the presidency, he had a better opportunity to make his principles in this respect felt. In the long and acrimonious controversy on the repeal of the Judiciary Act, he took an active part, not merely as Speaker, but as champion of the repeal on the floor of the House. His most characteristic speech was delivered on this occasion. In it he combated the Federalist position that repeal was unconstitutional; he also laid down a principle which was not new in the national legislature, but which was radical in the extreme, namely, that the state legislature could instruct with authority their Senators in Congress and recommend to their Representatives how they should vote on important questions. This would have been placing United States Senators substantially on the ground of ambassadors of their respective states, not unlike that of the representatives of the German states in the Imperial Bundesrath in Berlin. Macon's friend Randolph, however, went a step further and declared that his state could also instruct Representatives. To meet this, James A. Bayard of Delaware replied that he was as much a representative of Virginia as was Randolph himself. This policy of the two most important southern leaders was not without influence throughout the south and west. It was the foundation-stone of the Jacksonian democracy in so far as it put the will of the sovereign people as expressed in the legislatures above all other authority. Macon also favored expansion and growth of the state courts to meet the increasing demands of the country. Although Macon was not an enemy to the Supreme Court, as were Jefferson and Randolph, he was in himself a standing protest against John Marshall's great constructive decisions. He opposed the impeachment measures which ruined Randolph and taught Jefferson that there were limitations to the powers of a great popular majority.

It has been said that secession began with Jefferson in 1798, was accentuated by Randolph, and became a creed with the southern states after 1832; in other words, that Jefferson, John Randolph, and Calhoun were the apostles of this great dogma. This was in the main correct, but Macon was as important as Randolph in this development. He stood for the state as it was in 1789, and for a doctrine which was the legacy of the province, a legacy of intensely angry political struggles during the Revolution; he stood, as he said, for a state which could at will withdraw its Senators from Congress, and which did receive representatives from foreign courts, ac-

credited to its chief magistrates as late as 1793.¹ Ten years before Randolph was heard of he was an advocate of the essential features of Randolph's policy in the House of Representatives. It was the latter who became the political complement of the former, not the reverse. But Randolph's strange personality and his telling stage-acting first brought Macon's doctrine prominently before the nation. These two men acquiring great influence and becoming, as it were, god-fathers to the younger generation of southern politicians, outlined thus the policy of nullification during the early years of Jefferson's first administration. Can we be surprised then at Macon's sending Jackson in 1833 an angry protest against the proclamation on nullification? He wrote Samuel P. Carson² Feb. 9, 1833: "I have never believed a State could nullify and remain in the Union, but I have always believed that a State might secede when she pleased, provided she would pay her proportion of the public debt; and this right I have considered the best guard to public liberty and to public justice that could be desired. The proclamation contains principles as contrary to what was the Constitution as Nullification. It is the great error of the administration which, except that, has been satisfactory in a high degree. A government of opinion established by sovereign States for special purposes can not be maintained by force."

One of the severest criticisms of Macon's career, so far as students have criticised at all, has been that he constantly voted against all naval appropriations, even when war was imminent. The key to this part of his policy is to be found in his determination to prevent the least increase of power in the hands of the easterners. A navy, he thought, would be manned and controlled by Connecticut and Massachusetts, in other words, by the most capable seamen in the country. He was an agrarian who believed that the products of the plantation would find their way to European markets without our aid. It was immaterial to him whether Old or New England carried his tobacco to London. He would not have given a dollar to secure the carrying trade of the Atlantic.

The first speech he made in Congress on an important bill was in favor of a protective tariff for the encouragement of the infant cotton industry. This was in 1792. He prophesied that cotton-growing would become a source of great wealth to the United States. It is interesting to notice that this early attempt at protection to infant industries failed, because influential members of Congress thought cotton planting would destroy the fertility of the soil

¹ Governor Speight's message to North Carolina Assembly, November, 1793.

² Representative from North Carolina, 1822-1833.

and ultimately impoverish the nation. Almost as many members from the south as from the north voted against the cotton protective tariff. But Macon, more alert than some have thought, was in closer touch with the interests of his state and he declared that the people there had "already gone largely in the cultivation of that plant."¹ Three years later, however, when Nicholas J. Roosevelt and Jacob Mark presented a petition to Congress asking for protection for an "infant" iron industry which they were promoting, he opposed it, notwithstanding his friend Gallatin favored the scheme. Macon said: "The best policy of all such cases is to leave that kind of business to the industry of our citizens; they will work the mines if it is to their interest to do so."² It was the question here as to whose ox was to be helped out of the ditch.

At the extra session of Congress in 1797, when the bill providing for a large increase of the navy for the protection of commerce was pending, Macon was able to get an amendment passed which provided that the proposed frigates, when built and manned, should not be sent without the waters of the United States. This amendment was defeated in the Senate, but Macon and his friends were so persistent and powerful in their opposition that the plan was about to fail, and Samuel Sewall of Massachusetts declared: "Gentlemen who depend upon agriculture for every thing need not put themselves to the expense of protecting the commerce of the country; commerce is able to protect itself if they will only suffer it to do so. Let those States which live by commerce be separated from the Confederacy. Their collected industry and property are equal to their own protection and let other parts of the Confederacy take care of themselves."³

When Jefferson's non-importation measure was brought before Congress in February 1806, Macon opposed all that part of it which recommended the building of war vessels and coast fortifications, but favored the proposition for gun boats: "I believe them better adapted," said he, "to the defense of our harbors than any other. If we were now at war with any other nation, however gentlemen may be surprised at the declaration, I think we should do well to lend our navy to another nation also at war with that which we might be at war; for I think such a nation would manage it more to our advantage than ourselves."⁴ A curious policy to be sure was this, but it was in accord with his general attitude toward

¹ *Annals of Cong.*, 1792, 560.

² *Annals of Cong.*, 4th Cong., 1819-1820.

³ *Annals of Cong.*, 5th Cong., 385.

⁴ *Annals of Cong.*, 9th Cong., 1st Sess., 524.

naval armaments. The Southern agriculturalists had, from the beginning, opposed all such outlay, claiming that it was useless and believing, without saying as much however, that every ship built at the national expense to protect trade added to the power which was one day to grapple with their section in a fearful struggle for supremacy. In view of this final termination of the intense rivalry between the sections, Macon's political foresight was not so poor as might at first appear. During the trying period of non-importation and embargo, he had his idea of agricultural supremacy clearly in view. He opposed every measure of the first Republican administration which seemed to obscure this issue.

In this policy Randolph joined him, though as much from motives of enmity to the President as from jealousy of New England. But Macon and Randolph were both staunch advocates of this so-called "mud-turtle" plan of Southern politicians. Randolph spoke out distinctly their view of things when he said in the debate on non-importation: "What is the question in dispute? The carrying trade. What part of it? The fair, the honest and useful trade that is engaged in carrying our own productions to foreign markets and bringing back their productions in exchange? No, Sir, it is that carrying trade which covers enemy's property and carries the coffee, the sugar, and other West Indian products to the mother country. No, Sir, if this great agricultural nation is to be governed by Salem and Boston, New York and Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk and Charleston, let gentlemen come out and say so. I, for one, will not mortgage my property and my liberty to carry on this trade."¹ When Randolph declared he would never vote a shilling for a navy and Macon said, "lend your navy to a foreign enemy of our enemy," they were opposing New England and speaking for their own section, for their own agrarian interests. Commerce and great cities had no more attractions for Macon than for Randolph or Jefferson.

In connection with this subject, Macon's attitude toward slavery is to be considered. His view of the question may best be seen in his attitude to the prohibition of the importation of slaves into the United States. This measure came up in 1807. By the compromises on which the national Constitution is based, this traffic might be forever forbidden after January 1, 1808. But the economic conditions of the South had changed since 1787; and South Carolina, supported by the silent good-will of her sister states, now claimed that Congress could not constitutionally abolish the slave trade against the will and wish of a sovereign state. So much for the

¹ Quoted in Garland's *Life of Randolph*, I. 233.

growth of the idea of state supremacy, a growth fostered by everlasting disputes between the South and the East, a growth dependent on the economic change just mentioned—cotton-growing based on plenteous slave labor. It was a question of dollars and cents, Macon thought, not of human freedom, which animated both sides in Congress. The prosperity of the South depended now on slavery, on agricultural development; that of the East on commerce which the Southern members so constantly decried and often crippled. The growth of the slave power was to the East what the advancement of commerce was to the South—success of a rival bent on controlling the Union in its own interest. The morality of the question was a secondary consideration; though, as in a similar question of recent date, the speeches of the leaders were filled with moral and humanitarian professions. Macon said in committee of the whole: "I still consider this a commercial question. The laws of nations have nothing more to do with it than the laws of the Turks or the Hindoos. If this is not a commercial question, I would thank the gentlemen to show what part of the Constitution gives us any right to legislate on this subject." Macon regretted sincerely the existence of the "dread institution," yet he was as sincerely determined to maintain it as a right of the state and a check against the supremacy of the East. Both he and Randolph now maintained that a state could, if it desired, continue the slave trade independently of the Union, and they began to see that the equal growth of the South with the North depended on the expansion of the slave power. Here the second part of Macon's life-long policy, agriculturalism, became identical with the first, state sovereignty.

Macon did a great deal to put Jefferson in the presidential chair. North Carolina was the home of a strong Adams party, and it was with no little pains that the Republicans overcame the influence of the wealthy families enlisted under the banner of Federalism. Soon after the inauguration, Macon was given control of the federal patronage in his state; this led to very cordial and confidential relations between the President and the Speaker of the House. And when Jefferson sounded Congress in 1802 with regard to his aggressive policy on the Mississippi, he received immediate assurance that he would be supported in any reasonable scheme he might set in motion for acquiring the control of lower Louisiana. The purchase of Louisiana, as all the world knows, was as much a piece of good luck as it was the result of Jefferson's policy of expansion. When Macon heard of the favorable turn of things in Paris he wrote the President that "the acquisition of Louisiana has given general satisfaction, though the terms are not correctly known. But if it is within the compass of

the present revenue, the purchase, when the terms are known, will be more admired than even now." And then he adds what must have given his correspondent genuine satisfaction and which indicates Macon's own political policy, "if the Floridas can be obtained on tolerable terms we shall have nothing to make us uneasy, unless it be the party madness of some of our dissatisfied citizens."¹ From this time on he never lost sight of the acquisition of Florida as one of the items of sound policy. There was much talk a little later about giving Louisiana to Spain in exchange for Florida, but Macon seems not to have given assent to any such plan.² He was much interested in the acquisition of southern territory because he saw the significance of these possessions, first for the southern states and then for the Union. The balance of power between the two sections of the country was what he desired to see maintained even at that early stage.

January 1811, when the question of the admission of the new territory of Orleans was agitating the country, Macon expressed publicly his policy with regard to gaining southern territory; "much as the Southern country is desired and great is the convenience of possessing it"—were the terms he used. Not as territory, "not as a dependency," but as independent southern states did he wish to hold that country.³ The same ideas prevailed with him in 1819 when Florida was annexed. But another question had the attention of Congress and the country—the organization and control of Missouri.⁴ In a letter to Bartlett Yancey, of North Carolina, touching this subject, he regrets very much the loss of "Stone's motion which would have given two degrees more to the people of the South." With the failure, as Macon regarded it, of the South in the Missouri Compromise, his active participation in the expansion of the slave power closed. Randolph and Macon remained firm in their attitude toward this question and both voted against the Missouri Compromise. But the time had long since passed when Southern congressmen gave sincere attention to the counsels of Macon and Randolph; men were then filled with the ideas which Clay represented. It was not until 1832, when both were retired forever from active politics, that Southerners with Calhoun as their leader returned to what Macon always stood for, state supremacy, and only in 1837-1842 was it that their scheme of aggressive expansion became the creed of the great South Carolinian.⁵

¹ Letter of September 3, 1803.

² Letter to Joseph H. Nicholson, August 6, 1803.

³ *Annals of Cong.*, 11th Cong., III. 305.

⁴ *Annals of Cong.*, 16th Cong., 1st Sess., I. 97-100.

⁵ Woodrow Wilson, *Division and Reunion*, p. 143 ff.

A paper on Macon would scarce be complete without considering his influence and power in pressing upon the nation the ideas he represented. In 1796 he became the undisputed leader of the Jefferson party in North Carolina; in 1799 the last attempt to defeat him was made. The same year he established in Raleigh the first and greatest partizan newspaper the state has ever had. Joseph Gales was its editor. Macon and Gales and their companions in politics waged a fierce and successful war of words in North Carolina in 1800. They carried the state for their party, but they could not prevent the election of four powerful Federalist congressmen in 1801. But these were defeated in 1803 through the industry and ability of Gales rather than of Macon. All parties recognized Macon's right to leadership in his state from 1803 to 1828; and his authority was never questioned in his own party after 1803 except temporarily in 1808, when he opposed Madison's candidacy, preferring Gallatin instead.

In national affairs his period of power was from 1801 to 1812. It began with his almost undisputed election to the speakership of the House. In the chair he was the equal of any who had occupied it; he used its almost despotic powers more often than any predecessor had done. He was without a Republican competitor in 1803 and with his faithful friend Randolph as chairman of the committee on ways and means, there was no defeating measures of which he approved. He was positive enough to make his wishes known by setting aside the precedent of the Speaker's voting only in the case of a tie and having his vote registered as that of a member of the House. The present plan of presidential balloting, which required an amendment to the Constitution, was passed by his vote. Between 1803 and 1807 he allowed his friendship for Randolph and his dislike of Jefferson's supposed leaning toward Madison to lead him astray. He favored openly the candidacy of Monroe for President and opposed much of the non-importation plans of the administration; he even winked at Randolph's foolish scheme of feigning sickness in 1806 in order, as chairman of the committee on ways and means, to defeat Jefferson's foreign policy just referred to. This caused a breach between the President and the Speaker, a breach which resulted in the complete isolation of Macon. He was succeeded by Varnum in 1807. Jefferson commanded the Northern Republicans whom his conciliatory policy had called into prominence, and he still held enough of the Southerners to carry through all essential schemes. Randolph's bizarre actions and wild speeches soon caused Macon to regret the political side of their David-and-Jonathan friendship, and before 1809 we find him

voting in the main with the administration. At the opening of Congress in 1809 he was the choice of all Southern Republicans for Speaker and missed the election by only twenty votes. This returning popularity brought immediate recognition on the part of an administration floundering about in a slough of despondency. The way out of the bogs of embargo was being so earnestly sought after, that Macon, as a popular leader of the "old Republicans," became one of the first characters of the country. Any bill he championed was likely to pass, but he did not bring one forward until after the Embargo Act had been repealed and a solution of all foreign difficulties was sought by Madison in 1810.

As a result of the very large vote for the speakership Macon was made chairman of the committee on foreign relations for the first session of the eleventh Congress. He at once introduced a series of resolutions looking to the settlement of our difficulties with the warring powers of Europe. The resolutions were debated somewhat at length and finally changed to the famous Macon Bill No. 1, which was undoubtedly an administration measure and which Gallatin had much to do with framing, but not all. After more than a month of debate the bill finally passed the House, January 27, 1820. Its main features were: (1) To exclude English and French war and merchant ships from American ports; (2) to restrict importations from England and France except such as came in American vessels; (3) to admit only such imports as should come direct from the country producing them. The bill also repealed the non-intercourse laws and limited the duration of the proposed act to March 4, 1810.¹

The purpose of Macon's plan was to make England and France feel America's power and to set the nation that refused to recognize our rights as neutrals clearly in the wrong before all sections of the country. But the Senate dominated by anti-Gallatin men defeated Macon's bill in order to humiliate its reputed author. Macon Bill No. 2 was then introduced; but with this Macon had nothing whatever to do, not even voting for it on its final passage, May 1.² This bill promised free trade with either England or France in case either repealed its restrictive laws on neutral commerce. The nation which refused to change its policy was to be allowed no imports whatever into the United States. This plan was little more than a bid to France to come to America's assistance and thus to isolate England completely, for no one expected the latter country to yield

¹ *Annals of Cong.*, 11th Cong., II. 2582-2637.

² Letter to Joseph H. Nicholson, April 10, 1810; *Annals of Cong.*, 11th Cong., II. 1763.

to our demands.¹ The Macon bills occupied Congress throughout the session. Being the mouthpiece of the government, besides a most popular leader, Macon was practically the first character in Congress and among the first in the country.

With the beginning of the War of 1812 and the appearance in Congress of Calhoun, Clay, Lowndes, Cheves—the younger generation of politicians—Macon's influence in national affairs came practically to an end. He remained easily first in North Carolina, however, as long as he lived.

Macon's place and influence in Southern history is alongside that of John Randolph; he was before Randolph in his advocacy of state supremacy and more influential at all times because more practical and reasonable; he was a Southern agrarian of the Jeffersonian type and in this he was in full accord with Randolph; his policy of southern expansion was a dim outlining of Calhoun's aggressive plan of 1842; and this attitude of his compelled him to espouse the cause of slavery since slavery was the basis of Southern wealth, and necessary as a weapon with which to fight the free states. His influence was based on the control of his own state and on the confidence which his unimpeachable sincerity and honesty inspired.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

¹ Schouler, *History of the United States*, II. 229.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

I.

IN one of his essays Hazlitt describes an old English mystery play in which Adam is introduced, crossing the stage, on his way to be created. Was I to undertake the same representation of the earliest form of that political dogma or belief that later became known as the Monroe doctrine, I might easily fall into the same violation of dramatic unities. Scattered phrases in the writings of the political leaders of the early years of the republic might easily lend themselves to an interpretation according to later events. The policy of political isolation so solemnly enjoined in the farewell address of Washington, the uniform practice of a strict neutrality, and the diplomatic wishes and negotiations of Jefferson and Madison were so many distinct threads, which were to be gathered in support of a manly independence and almost indifference to European movements. My task is really a restricted one, and covers the events of less than four months of the year 1823. I intend to show how a question which arose as a distinctly European question was changed to an American matter; how it was altered from one pertaining solely to the relations between the United States and England to one that concerned our relations with all Europe; and, finally, the part borne by John Quincy Adams in reaching a determination.

Something must be said of the conditions existing in 1823 bearing upon the problem which the Monroe doctrine was to solve. Europe was under the control of the Holy Alliance. Originally formed by a combination of Austria, Prussia, Russia and Great Britain to administer upon the wreck of Napoleon's ambitions, the Alliance was continued as a police body, to assure the peace of the civilized world. France had now joined it, and to attain the ends of the union a full and combined support was to be given to legitimate or monarchical governments as against any revolutionary movement originating from the people. Starting from the doctrine of the divine right of kings, it was easy to reach the conclusion that the rule of a legitimate monarch was not to be questioned, and in short, monarchy was the only form of government which could not be reformed or improved. A policy of this nature, supported by force and applied with all the horrors of war, could not well appeal

to the English government. In the first case to be thus treated, the Neapolitan revolution, England protested against the Alliance making it a common question. Let it be Austrian, because Austrian interests were vitally concerned; but it should not be European. Her protests were unheeded, and an Austrian army acting for the Holy Alliance, ruthlessly crushed the popular movement in Naples and in Piedmont.

When the Spanish affairs called for notice in 1822, the King had been forced to accept the constitution of 1812, and the members of the Alliance believed the peace of Europe was threatened. Great Britain first sought to act as a mediator, but her offered services were not accepted. The Congress of Verona determined to restore Ferdinand to his throne, untrammelled by any constitution, and to France was given the congenial task. Spanish interests, however, were not confined to Europe. Her possessions in South America had for some time been in rebellion against her, and the United States alone had recognized their independence and accorded to them the rights of independent nations. If legitimacy was to be restored and maintained in Spain, no great stretch of the imagination was needed to believe that the Alliance, having accomplished its task in Spain, would extend its principles to Spanish America, and seek to restore the authority of Spain. The same idea might be pushed even further. As the great example of a successful democratic revolution, the United States could hardly have been pleasing to the Holy Alliance, and the more timid were ready to picture an invasion of this country by the combined European powers.

As a fact Great Britain offered a barrier to any such movement against either South or North America. Not only had the difference which showed itself in the Naples incident been greatly widened by the French invasion of Spain, but the price of obtaining the support of England could not be paid by the Allies. Firmly opposed to the attempt of the Alliance to regulate the internal concerns of a neighboring sovereign state, and disapproving the idea of imposing upon Spain the unrestricted rule of a monarch like Ferdinand, her ministers had held aloof from the movement, and adopted an attitude of a strict and undeviating neutrality, a neutrality not liable to alteration towards either party, so long as the honor and just interests of Great Britain were equally respected by both. Beyond a formal protest the British Cabinet would not go. Commercial interests and the wish to stand well with the Holy Alliance dictated its conduct in this affair, and the English people were thus apparently arrayed on the side of despotism.

Yet England did entertain some apprehension of the intentions

of the French government. Cuba was still a colony loyal to Spain, but was a prize worthy attention. There could be no objection to the island's remaining in Spanish possession; it was at the thought that the United States or France might covet it, that the head of the English ministry was alarmed. In November, 1822, Canning laid before the Cabinet a memorandum suggesting that "important as the interests may be which are now in discussion at Verona, yet, in the present state of the world, no questions relating to continental Europe can be more immediately and vitally important to Great Britain than those which relate to America." English commerce was suffering from outrages inflicted by the subjects of Spain, as well as from pirates and marauders "who bear no national character, and for whom no Government is answerable," meaning the Spanish possessions in America. These conditions had obliged the admiralty to afford convoy to merchant vessels trading to the ports of the Colombian republic. "Convoy in time of peace!" exclaimed Canning, "and against the attacks of a nation with which we are professedly in amity!" What a preposterous position for the first maritime power of the world! The attitude of the United States in recognizing the *de facto* independence of the Spanish colonies, in claiming a right to trade with them, and in avenging any interruption of the exercise of that right, implied a more straightforward course, and presented itself before the world a more intelligible position, than did the conduct of Great Britain.

There was a danger that the United States in pursuing this policy would make a military occupation of Cuba a part of the system of security against further depredations on American vessels. Canning claimed to have information giving countenance and probability to a rumored occupation of Cuba by the United States. "It may be questioned," he continued, "whether any blow that could be struck by any foreign Power in any part of the world, would have a more sensible effect on the interests of this country, and on the reputation of its Government." He therefore proposed to send a strong fleet to the Caribbean Sea to put an end to the depredations from pirates, and to check any intentions the United States might have upon Cuba. He also raised the question whether the time had not come for recognizing in some manner the Spanish colonies. "Spain and her colonial empire are altogether separated *de facto*. She has perhaps as little direct and available power over the colonies which she nominally retains, as she has over those which have thrown off her yoke."¹ Had it not been for the internal disturbances of Spain

¹The "Memorandum" is printed in Stapleton, *Some Correspondence of George Canning*, I. 48.

and its invasion from France, there is every reason to believe that Great Britain would have recognized the South American republics at this time.

This was not to be, and when the armies of France entered Spain Canning sought to obtain some expression from France as to Spanish territory. A permanent occupation of Spain was out of the question, but the conqueror might demand compensation in the colonies. So Canning laid down the position of Great Britain on another interesting matter:—

“With respect to the Provinces in America, which have thrown off their allegiance to the Crown of Spain, time and the course of events appear to have substantially decided their separation from the Mother Country; although the formal recognition of these Provinces, as Independent States, by His Majesty, may be hastened or retarded by various external circumstances, as well as by the more or less satisfactory progress, in each State, towards a regular and settled form of Government. Disclaiming in the most solemn manner any intention of appropriating to Himself the smallest portion of the late Spanish possessions in America, His Majesty is satisfied that no attempt will be made by France, to bring under her dominion any of those possessions, either by conquest, or by cession, from Spain.”¹

If Canning's purpose was to elicit a similar pledge from France it was not successful, and the possibility remained that Cuba might be offered to France and accepted, as indemnity or as spoils of war. Thus the apprehension of Canning remained unallayed, and the Cuban question persisted to color his relations with France and the United States.

Nor were such apprehensions respecting Cuba confined to Canning. At the very time he was preparing his interrogatory disclaimer for France, Monroe and his cabinet were considering the possibility of Great Britain's taking Cuba. Calhoun was for war with England, if she meant to take Cuba, a proposition so very general that the mere statement of Adams that the United States could not prevent such a seizure or cession was a sufficient answer. Monroe wished to offer to Great Britain a mutual promise not to take Cuba. A course so unnecessary and objectionable met with little favor at the hands of his advisers. Calhoun opposed it because nothing would be gained by it, and Adams thought it would involve a plunge into European politics. Calhoun did not readily change his opinion, and he merely moved his ground so as to be in favor of war with England, if she wanted to take Cuba against the wishes of the islanders. The doctrine of the consent of the governed would have sounded strange at that time in any language but English; it would have sounded strange uttered anywhere on English terri-

¹ George Canning to Sir Charles Stuart, March 31, 1823.

tory. In a despatch to Hugh Nelson, the American minister in Spain, dated April 28, 1823, Adams stated the position of the administration as to Cuba.

"You will not conceal from the Spanish Government the repugnance of the United States to the transfer of the Island of Cuba by Spain, to any other power. The deep interest which would to them be involved in the event gives them the right of objecting against it; and as the People of the Island itself are known to be averse to it, the right of Spain herself to make the cession, at least upon the principles on which the present Spanish constitution is founded, is more than questionable. Informal and verbal communications on this subject with the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs will be most advisable. In casual conversation, and speaking as from your own impressions, you may suggest the hope, that if any question of transferring the Island to any other Power is or shall be in agitation, it will not be withheld from your knowledge or from ours; that the condition of Cuba cannot be changed without affecting in an eminent degree the welfare of this Union, and consequently the good Understanding between us and Spain. That we should consider an attempt to transfer the Island, against the Will of its Inhabitants, as subversive of their rights, no less than of our interests; and that, as it would give them the perfect right of resisting such transfer, by declaring their own Independence, so if they should, under those circumstances, resort to that measure, the United States will be fully justified in supporting them to carry it into effect."¹

The military progress of France in Spain was approaching an end, and the invaders had met with so little opposition that they could count upon a final success in all their endeavors. Canning's apprehensions as to Cuba returned, and having received no direct assurances from France in answer to his veiled question on her possible ambitions for territory in America, he turned to the United States. Whether this was a studied intention or a sudden impulse is, to me, a matter of doubt. That Cuba, and its possible transfer by Spain to another power, were in Canning's thoughts, is certain; but it is by no means certain that he took the initiative. Rush had been urging him to recognize the South American states, and only an extreme caution prevented him from taking the suggestion. Had he been entirely disinterested he could have entertained no doubt that the simplest and surest means of obtaining the support, even the alliance, of the United States was to announce openly what had been tacitly conceded, that the late Spanish colonies were indeed independent states. Canning's mind was more at ease when it spoke with a reservation, and the indirect course was adopted in this instance.

On August 16th Rush had an interview with Canning on the negotiations pending between the two countries, of which the South American situation formed no part. Near the close of the con-

¹ Adams's Instructions to Hugh Nelson, April 28, 1823. Adams's MSS.

versation Rush "transiently asked," whether there was not room to hope that the Spaniards might get the better of all their troubles, but received only a general reply. Pursuing the subject Rush intimated that should France ultimately effect her purpose of overthrowing the constitutional government in Spain, there was at least the consolation that Great Britain would not allow her to go further and lay her hands upon the Spanish colonies, or stop the progress of their emancipation. What Rush had in mind, and what he wished to recall to Canning's memory, were the sentiments expressed by the British premier in March, when writing to his representative in Paris—that the recognition of the Spanish colonies as independent nations might be hastened or retarded according to circumstances; and that England disclaimed all intention of appropriating the smallest portion of the late Spanish possessions in America. By this was to be understood, in terms sufficiently distinct, that Great Britain would not be passive under such an attempt by France. Canning, in reply, asked Rush what

"I thought my government would say to going hand in hand with this, in the same sentiment; not as he added that any concert in action under it, could become necessary between the two countries, but that the simple fact of our being known to hold the same sentiment would, he had no doubt, by its moral effect, put down the intention on the part of France, admitting that she should ever entertain it. This belief was founded he said upon the large share of the maritime power of the world which Great Britain and the United States shared between them, and the consequent influence which the knowledge that they held a common opinion upon a question on which such large maritime interests, present and future, hung, could not fail to produce upon the rest of the world. . . .

"Reverting to his first idea he again said, that he hoped that France would not, should even events in the Peninsula be favorable to her, extend her views to South America for the purpose of reducing the colonies, nominally perhaps for Spain, but in effect to subserve ends of her own; but that in case she should meditate such a policy, he was satisfied that the knowledge of the United States being opposed to it as well as Great Britain, could not fail to have its influence in checking her steps. In this way he thought good might be done by prevention, and peaceful prospects all round increased. As to the form in which such knowledge might be made to reach France, and even the other powers of Europe, he said in conclusion that that might probably be arranged in a manner that would be free from objection."

This talk was not only interesting in itself, but it was the first advance of that character that had ever been made by the British to the American government, in relation to the foreign affairs between the two nations. Rush was guarded in his answer, expressing no opinion in favor of the suggestions, yet abstaining as carefully from saying anything against them. He could merely promise

¹ Richard Rush to John Quincy Adams, August 10, 1823.

to lay them before his government. To Adams he expressed the inference that Canning's proposition was "a fortuitous one; yet he entered into it I thought with some interest."¹

Four days later, on August 20th, Canning embodied these points in a private and confidential note.

"Is not the moment come when our Governments might understand each other as to the Spanish American Colonies? And if we can arrive at such an understanding, would it not be expedient for ourselves, and beneficial for all the world, that the principles of it should be clearly settled and plainly avowed?"

"For ourselves we have no disguise.

1. We conceive the recovery of the Colonies by Spain to be hopeless.
2. We conceive the question of the recognition of them, as Independent States, to be one of time and circumstances.
3. We are, however, by no means disposed to throw any impediment in the way of an arrangement between them and the mother country by amicable negotiations.
4. We aim not at the possession of any portion of them ourselves.
5. We could not see any portion of them transferred to any other Power with indifference.

"If these opinions and feelings are as I firmly believe them to be, common to your Government with ours, why should we hesitate mutually to confide them to each other; and to declare them in the face of the world?"

"If there be any European Power which cherishes other projects, which looks to a forcible enterprize for reducing the colonies to subjugation, on the behalf or in the name of Spain; or which meditates the acquisition of any part of them to itself, by cession or by conquest; such a declaration on the part of your government and ours would be at once the most effectual and the least offensive mode of intimating our joint disapprobation of such projects.

"It would at the same time put an end to all the jealousies of Spain with respect to her remaining Colonies, and to agitation which prevails in those Colonies, an agitation which it would be but humane to allay; being determined (as we are) not to profit by encouraging it.

"Do you conceive that under the power which you have recently received, you are authorized to enter into negotiation and to sign any Convention upon this subject? Do you conceive, if that be not within your competence, you could exchange with me ministerial notes upon it?"

"Nothing could be more gratifying to me than to join with you in such a work, and, I am persuaded, there has seldom, in the history of the world, occurred an opportunity when so small an effort of two friendly Governments might produce so unequivocal a good and prevent such extensive calamities."

Rush sent to Washington a copy of this note in his despatch No. 325, dated August 23d.² Believing that Canning's note showed earnestness and cordiality towards the government of the United States, he wished to meet its suggestion in such a manner as not to compromise his government with either France or Spain, or to im-

¹ Richard Rush to John Quincy Adams, August 19, 1823. The despatch is summarized in Rush's *Memoranda*, 399-404.

² Printed in Rush's *Memoranda*, 415.

plicate it in any degree in the federative system of Europe. The only point that could not be accepted by the United States was Canning's second, merely because the United States had already recognized the full independence of the South American states.

Rush had barely sent off his despatch when he received another "private and confidential" note from Canning, dated at Liverpool, mentioning an additional motive for coming to a speedy determination.

GEORGE CANNING TO RICHARD RUSH.

Private and confidential.

LIVERPOOL, August 23, 1823.

MY DEAR SIR,—Since I wrote to you on the 20th, an additional motive has occurred for wishing that we might be able to come to some understanding on the part of our respective Governments on the subject of my letter; to come to it soon, and to be at liberty to announce it to the world.

It is this. I have received notice, but not such a notice as imposes upon me the necessity of any immediate answer or proceeding—that so soon as the military objects in Spain are achieved (of which the French expect, how justly I know not, a very speedy achievement) a proposal will be made for a Congress, or some less formal concert and consultation, specially upon the affairs of Spanish America.

I need not point out to you all the complications to which this proposal, however dealt with by us, may lead.

Pray receive this communication in the same confidence with the former; and believe me with great truth

My Dear Sir, and esteem,

Your obedient and faithful servant,

(Signed) GEO. CANNING.

The proposition to convene a congress of European powers to consider American affairs, with or without the presence and participation of the United States, was one that could not be acceptable to the American minister, much less so to the government he represented. It did not require any instructions from Washington to characterize the proposed congress as an uncalled for measure, one indicative of a policy highly unfriendly to the tranquillity of the world. The United States could not look "with insensibility upon such an exercise of European jurisdiction over communities now of right exempt from it, and entitled to regulate their own concerns unmolested from abroad." If Great Britain would recognize this independence, Rush would make a declaration, "in the name of my Government, that it will not remain inactive under an attack upon the independence of those States by the Holy Alliance," making it explicitly, and avowing it before the world.¹

It will now be necessary to pass to the United States, where Rush's three despatches and their enclosures arrived at the Depart-

¹ Richard Rush to John Quincy Adams, August 28, 1823. The despatch (No. 326) is printed in Rush's *Memoranda*, 420.

ment of State, October 9th. Unfortunately the *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams* are silent from September 11th, when the writer was at Quincy, to November 7th, nearly a month after Canning's advances had become known to the President. We have, therefore, no record of the first impressions they made upon Monroe and his Cabinet. Two days after their receipt Monroe asked for copies of them, and these he took with him into Virginia, when he went to his country-seat for a rest. His object was to ask advice from Jefferson and Madison, to whom he sent the copies without informing Adams that he had taken this somewhat unusual and indiscreet step. For a disclosure of the papers would have greatly embarrassed the Secretary of State, and destroyed the usefulness of Rush in London, not to speak of the unfortunate position Monroe himself would have occupied. His letter to Jefferson expressed his doubts and suggested a possible policy to be pursued; but a careful reading fails to develop a decided opinion on his part. He would meet the proposal of the British government, and hints in no doubtful manner that the occasion may be a fair one for departing from the "sound maxim" of political isolation.

MONROE TO JEFFERSON.

OAKHILL October 17th 1823

DEAR SIR,—I transmit to you two despatches, which were receiv'd from Mr. Rush, while I was lately in Washington, which involve interests of the highest importance. They contain two letters from Mr. Canning, suggesting designs of the holy alliance, against the Independence of S^a America, and proposing a cooperation, between G. Britain and the U States, in support of i, against the members of that alliance. The project aims in the first instance, at a mere expression of opinion, somewhat in the abstract, but which it is expected by Mr. Canning, will have a great political effect, by defeating the combination. By Mr. Rush's answers, which are also inclosed, you will see the light in which he views the subject, and the extent to which he may have gone. Many important considerations are involved in this proposition. 1st Shall we entangle ourselves, at all, in European politicks, and wars, on the side of any power, against others, presuming that a concert by agreement, of the kind proposed, may lead to that result? 2^d If a case can exist, in which a sound maxim may, and ought to be departed from, is not the present instance, precisely that case? 3^d Has not the epoch arriv'd when G. Britain must take her stand, either on the side of the monarchs of Europe, or of the U States, and in consequence, either in favor of Despotism or of liberty and may it not be presum'd, that aware of that necessity, her government, has seiz'd on the present occurrence, as that, which it deems, the most suitable, to announce and mark the commencement of that career.

My own impression is that we ought to meet the proposal of the British gov^t, and to make it known, that we would view an interference on the part of the European powers, and especially an attack on the Colonies, by them, as an attack on ourselves, presuming that if they

succeeded with them, they would extend it to us. I am sensible however of the extent, and difficulty of the question, and shall be happy to have yours, and Mr. Madison's opinions on it. I do not wish to trouble either of you with small objects, but the present one is vital, involving the high interests, for which we have so long and so faithfully, and harmoniously, contended together. Be so kind as to enclose to him the despatches, with an intimation of the motive. With great respect etc

JAMES MONROE

Recd Oct 23¹

Both Jefferson and Madison were in favor of accepting Canning's advances, as by that means Great Britain would be separated from the Holy Alliance. Madison was the more radical in favoring some material aid to Spain and Greece in their contests against combined Europe. This sentimental idea is not sufficient to convict Madison of "playing politics," for he had run his public career, and had nothing in the future. There can be no doubt, however, that others were urging such a policy because they knew it would be popular with the United States. The picture of a people struggling for liberty appealed strongly to leading members of both political parties; and the "witchery" of the South American question was nearly repeated in the Greek problem.

While Monroe was in Virginia an incident happened which led to the injection into this question of the South American states of a new factor—Russia. Baron de Tuvill, the Russian minister at Washington, called upon the Secretary of State on October 16th, and informed him that his master, the Emperor, would not receive any minister or agent from any of the governments recently formed in the new world. While he had not been instructed to make an official communication of this fact to the American government, he was instructed to make this determination of the Emperor known, so that there might no doubt be entertained with regard to his intentions. He also made a verbal expression of the satisfaction with which the Emperor had observed that the government of the United States, in recognizing the independence of the South American states, had declared its intention to persevere in that neutrality it had hitherto observed. The minister said he would address a note to Mr. Adams, officially informing him of the Emperor's position as to diplomatic or consular agents from South America. The Secretary of State observed in reply, that upon the President's return from Virginia he

"would lay before him, as well the Note, which I should in the meantime receive from the Baron, as the purport of the oral communication which he then made to me. That I should probably be instructed

¹ From the Jefferson MSS.

to return a written answer to his Note, and that I should also be directed what to say in answer to his verbal remarks. That the Declaration of the American Government when they recognized the Southern American Nations, that they would persevere in the neutrality till then observed between Spain and her emancipated Colonies, had been made under the observance of a like neutrality by all the European Powers to the same contest. That so long as that state of things should continue, I could take upon me to assure the Baron, that the United States would not depart from the neutrality so declared by them. But that if one or more of the European powers should depart from their neutrality, that change of circumstances would necessarily become a subject of further deliberation in this Government, the result of which it was not in my power to foretell."

On the same day the promised official note was received from the minister :

"Sa Majesté Impériale a enjoint à son Ministre de me prévenir, que, fidèle aux principes politiques, qu'Elle suit de concert avec ses alliés, Elle ne pourra dans aucun cas recevoir auprès d'Elle aucun agent quelconque, soit de la Régence de Colombia, soit d'aucun des autres Gouvernemens de fait, qui doivent leur existence aux événemens, dont le nouveau monde a été depuis quelques années le théâtre."

Monroe returned from Virginia November 5th. Two days earlier despatches had been received from Rush showing an extraordinary change in Canning's tone. He was no longer pressing for a reply to his advances ; he was decidedly cool, and showed plainly that he was not prepared to give the pledge of an immediate recognition of the independence of the South American states, the pledge which alone would enable Rush to enter into his proposed joint announcement of policy. His note was couched in diplomatic language, but left little doubt of his altered disposition.

(*Enclosure with Mr. Rush's No. 330, September 8, 1823.*)

GEORGE CANNING TO RICHARD RUSH.

Private and Confidential.

STORRS, WESTMORLAND, Aug. 31, 1823.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have now to acknowledge the receipt of your answer to both my letters ; and whatever may be the practical result of our confidential communication, it is an unmixed satisfaction to me that the spirit in which it began on my part, has been met so cordially on yours.

To a practical result eminently beneficial I see no obstacle ; except in your want of specific powers, and in the delay which may intervene before you can procure them ; and during which events may get before us.

Had you felt yourself authorized to entertain any formal proposition, and to decide upon it, without reference home, I would immediately have taken measures for assembling my Colleagues in London, upon my return, in order to be enabled to submit to you as the *act* of my government, all that I have stated to you as my own *sentiments* and theirs. But with such a delay in prospect, I think I should hardly be justified in proposing to bind ourselves to any thing positively and unconditionally ; and think on the other hand that a proposition qualified either in respect to the con-

tingency of your concurrence in it, or with reference to possible change of circumstances, would want the decision and frankness which I should wish to mark our proceeding.

Not that I anticipate any change of circumstances, which could vary the views opened to you in my first letter:—nor that, after what you have written to me in return, I apprehend any essential dissimilarity of views on the part of your Government.

But *we* must not place ourselves in a position in which, if called upon from other quarters for an opinion, we cannot give a clear and definite account not only of what we think and feel, but of what we have done or are doing, upon the matter in question. To be able to say, in answer to such an appeal, that the United States and Great Britain concur in thinking so and so—would be well. To anticipate any such appeal by a voluntary declaration to the same effect would be still better. But to have to say that we are in communication with the United States but have no conclusive understanding with them, would be inconvenient—our free agency would thus be fettered with respect to other Powers; while our agreement with you would be yet unascertained.

What appears to me, therefore, the most advisable is that you should see in my unofficial communication enough hope of good to warrant you in requiring Powers and Instructions from your Government on this point, in addition to the others upon which you have recently been instructed and empowered; treating that communication *not* as a proposition made to you, but as the evidence of the nature of a proposition which it would have been my desire to make to you, if I had found you provided with authority to entertain it.

I have the honor to be, with the greatest esteem and respect,

My Dear Sir,

Your obedient and faithful servant,

(Signed) GEO. CANNING.

Not only did Rush on receiving this note regard the incident as closed, but his suspicions of Canning's motives were seriously aroused. "I am bound to own," he wrote in a private letter to Monroe, "that I shall not be able to avoid, at bottom, some distrust of the motives of all such advances to me, whether directly or indirectly, by this government, at this particular juncture of the world." Whatever evidences Great Britain had given of a tendency to liberalize her commercial policy, there was no recognizable prospect of the adoption of greater political freedom, whether in relation to herself or other states.

"We have seen her wage a war of 20 years at a cost of treasure and blood incalculable, in support of the independence of other states (as she said) when that independence was threatened by a movement proceeding from the *people* of France. We have seen her at the close of that contest abandoning the great interests of the people of other states, anxious apparently only about monarchs and thrones. We have seen her at the same epoch become in effect a member of the Holy Alliance; though she could not in form, and continue to abet its principles up to the attack on Naples. Even then the separation was but partial, and, true to her sympathy with the monarchical principle, we find her faith pledged and her

fleets ready to interpose not on any new extremity of wrong or oppression to the *people* of Naples, but on any molestation to the royal family. Since the present year set in, she has proclaimed and until now cautiously maintained her neutrality under an attack by France upon the independence of Spain, as unjust, as nefarious, and as cruel, as the annals of mankind can recount, this attack having been made upon the people of a country, by a legitimate king, urged on by legitimate nobles. It is thus that Britain has been from the very beginning, positively or negatively, auxiliary to the evils with which this Alliance under the mark of Christianity has already affected the old, and is now menacing the new world. It is under this last stretch of ambition that she seems about to be aroused, not, as we seem forced to infer after all we have seen, from any objections to the arbitrary principles of the Combination, for the same men are still substantially at the head of her affairs; but rather from the apprehensions which are now probably coming upon her, touching her own influence and standing through the formidable and encroaching career of these continental potentates. She at last perceives a crisis likely to come on, bringing with it peril to her own commercial prospects on the other side of the Atlantic, and to her political sway in both hemispheres. Hence probably some of her recent and remarkable solitudes. The former war of 20 years more than once shook her prosperity and brought hazards to her existence, though for the most part she was surrounded by allies. A second war of like duration with no ally for her in Europe might not have a second field of Waterloo for its termination. Such are the prospective dangers that possibly do not escape her.

"The estimate which I have formed of the genius of this government, as well as of the characters of the men who direct, or who influence, all its operations, would lead me to fear that we are not as yet likely to witness any very material changes in the part which Britain has acted in the world for the past fifty years, when the cause of freedom has been at stake; the part which she acted in 1774 in America, which she has since acted in Europe, and is now acting in Ireland. I shall therefore find it hard to keep from my mind the suspicion that the approaches of her ministers to me at this portentous juncture for a concert of policy which they have not heretofore courted with the United States, are bottomed on their own calculations. I wish that I could sincerely see in them a true concern for the rights and liberties of mankind. Nevertheless, whatever may be the *motive* of these approaches, if they give promise of leading to good *effects*, effects which the United States from principle and from policy would delight to hail, I grant that a dispassionate and friendly ear should be turned to them, and such shall be my aim in the duties before me."

The one or two subsequent incidental references to the matter made by Canning confirmed Rush in his views. On September 26th, Canning told him that Daniel Sheldon, American *chargé d'affaires* at Paris had assured the British ambassador that the United States was aware of all the projects of France and the Holy Alliance upon Spanish America, and disapproved of them. If Sheldon had been instructed to say that, surely Rush must be in the possession of sufficient authority of a like nature to accept Canning's propositions.

¹ Rush to Monroe, September 15, 1823. From the Monroe MSS.

Rush, however, was too cautious to be drawn even into an expression of opinion, and again insisted "that certainly I had none, other than those general instructions which I had already mentioned to him, evidently never framed to meet the precise crisis which he supposed to be at hand respecting Spanish America, but under the comprehensive spirit of which I was nevertheless willing to go forward with him in his proposals upon the terms I had stated, in the hope of meeting this crisis."

This rebuff threw Canning into a new offer of compromise. Great Britain, he declared, felt great embarrassments as regarded the immediate recognition of these new states, embarrassments which had not been common to the United States, and he asked whether Rush would not give his assent to the proposals on a promise by Great Britain of *future* acknowledgment. The American minister again avoided any commitment by giving an immediate and unequivocal refusal. "I cannot be unaware," he wrote to Adams, "that in this whole transaction the British cabinet are striving for their own ends; yet if these ends promise in this instance to be also auspicious to the safety and independence of all Spanish America, I persuade myself that we cannot look upon them but with approbation. England it is true has given her countenance, and still does, to all the evils with which the holy Alliance have afflicted Europe; but if she at length has determined to stay the career of their formidable and despotick ambition in the other hemisphere, the United States seem to owe it to all the policy and to all the principles of their system, to hail the effects whatever may be the motives of her conduct."

In a despatch dated October 10th, Rush reviewed the incident, and once more declared that the last word had in all probability been spoken.

"I saw him [Canning] again at the foreign office yesterday and he said not one single word relative to South America, although the occasion was altogether favorable for resuming the topick, had he been disposed to resume it. I therefore consider that all further discussion between us in relation to it is now at an end. I had myself regarded the questions involved in the discussion as essentially changed by the arrival of the news of the convention of the 4th of July between Buenos Ayres and the commissioners from Spain; and of the complete annihilation of the remnant of the royal forces in Colombia under Morales, on the third of August, both which pieces of intelligence have reached England since the twenty sixth of September, the date of my last conference with Mr. Canning on the South American subject.

"The termination of the discussion between us may be thought somewhat sudden, not to say abrupt, considering how zealously as well as spontaneously it was started on his side. As I did not commence it, it is not my intention to revive it. If I had actually acceded to his proposals,

I should have endeavored to have placed my conduct in a satisfactory light before the President. The motives of it would not, I flatter myself, have been disapproved. But as the whole subject is now before my government, and as I shall do nothing further in it without instructions, I should deem it out of place to travel into any new reasons in support of a step not in fact taken.

"Mr. Canning not having acceded to my proposal, nor I to his, we stand as we were before his first advance to me, with the exception only of the light which the intervening discussion may be supposed to have shed upon the dispositions and policy of England in this important matter. It appears that having ends of her own in view, she has been anxious to facilitate their accomplishment by invoking my auxiliary offices as the minister of the United States at this court; but as to the independence of the new states of America, for their own benefit, that this seems quite another question in her diplomacy. It is France that must not be aggrandized, not South America that must be made free. The former doctrine may fitly enough return upon Britain as part of her permanent political creed; but not having been taught to regard it as also incorporated with the foreign policy of the United States, I have forborne to give it gratuitous succour. I would have brought myself to minister to it incidentally on this occasion, only in return for a boon which it was in the power of Britain herself to have offered; a boon that might have closed the sufferings and brightened the prospects of those infant Republics emerging from the new world, and seeming to be connected as by a great moral chain with our own destinies.

"Whether any fresh explanations with France since the fall of Cadiz may have brought Mr. Canning to so full and sudden a pause with me, I do not know, and most likely never shall know if events so fall out that Great Britain no longer finds it necessary to seek the aid of the United States in furtherance of her schemes of counteraction as against France or Russia. That the British cabinet, and the governing portion of the British nation, will rejoice at heart in the downfall of the constitutional system in Spain, I have never had a doubt and have not now, so long as this catastrophe can be kept from crossing the path of British interests and British ambition. This nation in its collective, corporate, capacity has no more sympathy with popular rights and freedom now, than it had on the plains of Lexington in America; than it showed during the whole progress of the French revolution in Europe, or at the close of its first great act, at Vienna, in 1815; than it exhibited lately at Naples in proclaiming a neutrality in all other events, save that of the safety of the royal family there; or, still more recently, when it stood aloof whilst France and the Holy Alliance avowed their intention of crushing the liberties of unoffending Spain, of crushing them too upon pretexts so wholly unjustifiable and enormous that English ministers, for very shame, were reduced to the dilemma of speculatively protesting against them, whilst they allowed them to go into full action. With a king in the hands of his ministers, with an aristocracy of unbounded opulence and pride, with what is called a house of commons constituted essentially by this aristocracy and always moved by its influence, England can, in reality, never look with complacency upon popular and equal rights, whether abroad or at home. She therefore moves in her natural orbit when she wars, positively or negatively, against them. For their own sakes alone, she will never war in their favor."

The real cause of Canning's sudden indifference was not made

known until some weeks later. Unable to draw Rush into even a partial alliance, and as unable to meet Rush's primary condition of an immediate recognition of the South American states, Canning sought to obtain some distinct pledge from France of disinterestedness so far as the late Spanish possessions in America were concerned. Approaching the Prince de Polignac, then representing France at the English court, he obtained positive assurance on the lines of his own ideas. A joint memorandum was prepared October 9th, and in it the Prince de Polignac declared

"That his Government believed it to be utterly hopeless to reduce Spanish America to the state of its former relations to Spain ;

"That France disclaimed, on Her part, any intention or desire to avail Herself of the present State of the colonies, or of the present situation of France towards Spain, to appropriate to Herself any part of the Spanish Possessions in America, or to obtain for Herself any exclusive advantages ;

"And that, like England, She would willingly see the Mother Country in possession of superior commercial advantages, by amicable arrangements ; and would be contented, like Her, to rank, after the Mother Country, among the most favoured nations ;

"Lastly, that She abjured, in any case, any design of acting against the Colonies by force of arms." ¹

Canning read this paper to Rush, November 24th, but did not give him a copy of it until December 13th—or too late to have any influence upon the councils at Washington.

The interview between Adams and Baron Tuyll, already mentioned, occurred on October 16th, and the official note bore the same date. On October 18th Adams drafted a reply, and, of course, without any consultation with the absent President. This draft was not submitted to Monroe and his Cabinet until November 7th. In its first form, therefore, the thoughts and expressions were entirely those of Adams. In the cabinet meeting the Secretary explained that the Russian communications afforded a "very suitable and convenient opportunity for us to take our stand against the Holy Alliance, and at the same time to decline the overture of Great Britain. It would be more candid, as well as more dignified, to avow our principles explicitly to Russia and France, than to come in as a cock-boat in the wake of the British man-of-war." ² The draft of the letter to Baron Tuyll was then read. The following parallel shows the first draft, Monroe's alterations as completed on the 10th, and Adams's substitute paragraph added on the 11th. The date of

¹ The full text of the paper, except the paragraphs on the congress, will be found in *British and Foreign State Papers, 1823-1824*, p. 49. It is an interesting conjecture whether Canning did not use the half promise of Rush to co-operate when conversing with the representative of France. A hint that the United States would occupy the same position as England would carry great moral weight.

² *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 178.

the draft was originally October 18th, but November 15th was the day on which it was sent to the Russian minister.

ADAMS'S DRAFT.¹

THE BARON DE TUYLL,

Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from Russia.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE. WASHINGTON, 15th Nov^r 1823.

SIR,—I have had the honour of receiving your Note of the 4th inst^l communicating the information that His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias has determined in no case *whatsoever* to receive any agent whatsoever either from the Government of the Republic of Columbia, or from any other of the Governments de facto, which owe their existence to the Events of which the new World has for some years past been the theatre.

Influenced by the considerations which prescribe it as a duty to independent *Christian Nations of Christians* to entertain with each other, the friendly relations which sentiments of humanity and their mutual interests require, and satisfied that those of South America had become irrevocably Independent of Spain the Government of the United States **B** [have interchanged Ministers Plenipotentiary with the Republic of Colombia, have appointed Ministers of the same Rank to the Governments of Mexico, Buenos Ayres and Chili, have received a Minister and other Diplomatic Agents from Mexico, and will continue to receive and send Agents Diplomatic and Commercial, in their intercourse with the other American Independent Nations, as in the performance of their social duties, and in the pursuit of their lawful Interests they shall find *expedient* proper. While regretting that the political principles maintained by His Imperial Majesty and his allies, have not yet led the Imperial Government to the same result, and that they have not seen fit to receive the *diplomatic agent* Minister of *Peace* said to have been commissioned by the Republican Government of Colombia, to reside near his Imperial Majesty, the Government of the United States respecting in others that self-dependent Sovereignty which they exercise themselves, receive from you the information of his Majesty's determination on this subject in the Spirit of Candour, frankness, and of amicable disposition with which it is given.]

D. I avail myself of the occasion to reiterate to you, Sir, the assurance of my distinguished Consideration.

MONROE'S SUGGESTED CHANGES.²

B. The government of the U States thought it proper to acknowledge their independance, in March, 1822., by an act which was then published to the world. This government has since interchanged ministers with the republic of Columbia, has appointed ministers of the same rank to the governments of Mexico, Buenos Ayres, and Chili, has received a minister and other diplomatic agents from Mexico, and preservd, in other respects the same intercourse, with those new States, that they have with other powers.

By a recurrence to the message of the President, a copy of which is enclosed, you will find, that this measure was adopted on great consideration; that the attention of this gov^t had been called, to the contest, be-

¹What is enclosed in brackets was struck out by the President. Words in italics were also omitted from the final form of this letter.

²See Monroe's letter printed on p. 695.

tween the parent country and the Colonies, from an early period that it had marked the course of events with impartiality, and had become perfectly satisfied, that Spain could not reestablish her authority over them : that in fact the new States were completely independant. C.

[Under those circumstances my gov^t has heard with great regret, the information containd in your note that the political principles maintained by his Imperial Majesty and his allies, have not yet led the Imperial gov^t, to the same result. I am instructed however by the President to assure you, that this communication of H. I. M.'s determination, on this subject has been receivd in the spirit of candour, frankness, and of amicable disposition with which it is given.]

ADAMS'S SUBSTITUTE.

C. From the information contained in your Note, it appears that the political Principles maintained by His Imperial Majesty and his allies, have not led the Imperial Government to the same result. I am instructed by the President to assure you, that the Government of the United States respecting in others the Independence of the Sovereign authority, which they exercise themselves, receive the communication of H. I. M.'s determination on that subject in the Spirit of Candour, frankness and of amicable disposition which it is made. D.

It was Calhoun who objected to the words *Christian*, annexed to independent nations, and *of peace*, added to the word *minister* as sarcastic. In spite of Adams explaining that "all the point of my note was in these two words, as my object was to put the Emperor in the wrong in the face of the world as much as possible," they were struck from the draft. The cabinet meeting came to an end before the form of the note had been determined, but developed some difference of opinion upon the manner of replying to the Russian communications. As the communications with the Russian minister had been part verbal and part in writing, the Secretary thought it would be only proper to reply in the same manner. To answer the whole in one written note might place the Baron in an awkward predicament. But he warned the President that "the answer to be given to Baron Tuyll, the instructions to Mr. Rush relative to the proposals of Mr. Canning, those to Mr. Middleton at St. Petersburg, and those to the minister who must be sent to France, must all be part of a combined system of policy and adapted to each other." With the President Adams agreed to confine his written reply to the purport of the Baron's written note, and to see the Baron again upon the verbal part of his communication. This would be limited to an expression of the intention on the part of the United States to continue to remain neutral.

Before the note in its altered form could be prepared Adams was to see the Russian minister, and the 8th was the day appointed. Even in the interval of less than twenty-four hours, between the Cabinet meeting of the 7th and this conference, Monroe had doubts, wavered, and wrote to Adams as follows :

JAMES MONROE TO JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Nov^r 8, 1823.

DEAR SIR,—I called to confer a moment with you respecting the concerns depending with the minister of Russia, but not meeting with you, and hearing that you are expected to have an interview with the minister of Russia, to day, I drop you a few lines on that subject.

In the interview, I think that it will be proper, to extend your conversation and enquiries to every point, which seems to be embraced, by his note, and informal communication, with a view to make it the basis of all subsequent measures, either with Congress, or through Mr. Rush with the British gov^t. If you see no impropriety, in it, I think that I would ask him, whether he intended, by the terms "political principles" to refer to the governments established, in the new states, as distinguishing them from those of Europe. the strict import justifies the conclusion that he does, and that is supported by all the recent movements of the allied powers, in Europe. Still to give it that construction, without his sanction, in this form, might be objected to hereafter. I merely suggest this for your consideration, to which I add, that if there be cause to doubt the propriety of the step, you had better decline it, for further reflection, especially as other opportunities will present themselves, in future conferences with him, on the same subject.

On the other point I need add nothing at this time. Indeed I do not know that I can say anything, in addition to what was suggested on it yesterday. It is probable that something may occur in your conference, which may make it proper, to enlarge the sphere of the communication.

J. M.¹

The Baron came to the Department according to appointment on the same day. The Secretary told him that he

"had submitted to the President the Note from him declaring the Emperor's determination not to receive any Minister or Agent from any of the South American States, to which I should shortly send him an answer: that I had also reported to the President the substance of our verbal conferences: of what had been said by him, and of my answers. That the President had directed me to say that he approved of my answers as far as they had gone, and to add that he received the observations of the Russian Government relating to the neutrality of the United States in the contest between Spain, and the Independent States of South America, amicably; and in return for them wished him to express to the Court *the hope of the Government of the United States that Russia would on her part also continue to observe the same neutrality.* After some conversation the Baron desired me to repeat what I had said, that he might be sure of perfectly understanding me: which I did. He then observed that he should immediately prepare a dispatch to his Government, relating to the purport of this conversation, and (it being Saturday) that to be sure of its accuracy he would send it to my house the next day, requesting me to make any observations upon it that I should think advisable.

"At this conference, upon a suggestion from the President, I enquired of the Baron, what was the import of the words "political principles," in his note of $\frac{4}{16}$ October. He said they were used in the Instructions

¹ From the Adams MSS.

of his Government to him, and he understood them as having reference to the right of Supremacy of Spain over her Colonies; and that this appeared to him to be so clearly their meaning that he did not think it would be necessary for him to ask of his Government an explanation of them."¹

Two days later Monroe returned to Adams the draft of the letter to Tully with the changes he wished to have incorporated. His note was thoroughly characteristic, again showing the indecision of the writer.

JAMES MONROE TO JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

DEAR SIR,—I enclose you a modification, of your note in reply to that of the Russian minister for your consideration. The part for which it is proposed to be a substitute is marked with a pencil—tho' much of that thus marked is retained. You will be able to decide how far such a modification, will be proper from what may have taken place in your conference with the minister. The object is, to soften the communication, in some degree, without losing any portion of the decision called for by the occasion.

J. M.

Nov^r 10, 1823.²

Having replied to the communication from the Russian minister, it became necessary to make some reply to Canning's proposals. Apart from the suggestion that recognition was a matter of time and circumstance, there was nothing in the five heads that the United States had not already accepted as its policy. The guarded utterances of Rush in his exchange of notes with Canning had gone as far as it was possible to go without positive instructions from home, and those instructions could not have been issued without unduly binding our government to follow Great Britain in every contingency. The President, by the very form of his questions to Jefferson, implied that he would even favor a departure in this instance from the traditional policy of isolation. But Canning blundered. He intimated to Rush that the Alliance had intentions against the late Spanish colonies of South America, and urged the American minister to enter into a definite and binding compact. Yet he did not tell Rush from what source he had obtained this information, and thus gave rise to a suspicion that his solicitude was not entirely disinterested, or his urgency was not calculated to com-

¹ The Baron said the words were used "in the instructions of the Government to him, and he understood them to have reference to the right of supremacy of Spain over her colonies. I had so understood them myself, and had not entertained a moment's doubt as to their meaning." *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI, 182.

² From the Adams MSS. In noting the receipt of this letter from the President, Adams says, "I think also of proposing another modification." The *Memoirs* (VI, 184) tell us what this modification was—"leaving out entirely the expression of regret—which he approved."

promit Rush for the benefit of the British government. Upon the despatches from Rush, Adams commented: "The object of Canning appears to have been to obtain some public pledge from the government of the United States, ostensibly against the forcible interference of the Holy Alliance between Spain and South America; but really or especially against the acquisition to the United States themselves of any part of the Spanish-American possessions. . . By joining with her, therefore, in her proposed declaration, we give her a substantial and perhaps inconvenient pledge against ourselves, and really obtain nothing in return.¹

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

¹ *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 177.

RAMSAY AS A PLAGIARIST

IN THE *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for 1899, is a review of Gordon's history of the American Revolution.¹ From the evidence given there and from evidence since accumulated there seems to be no doubt whatever that Gordon can no longer be accepted as an authority in American history.² In Ramsay's *History of the American Revolution*,³ we find abundant evidence that the plagiarism which destroyed the value of Gordon's work is present also in the writing of his illustrious contemporary. In his preface to this work, dated October 30, 1789, Ramsay says: "The materials for the following sheets were collected in the years 1782, 1783, 1785 and 1786 in which years, as a member of Congress, I had access to all the official papers of the United States. Every letter written to Congress by General Washington, from the day he took the command of the American army till he resigned it, was carefully perused and its contents noted.

¹ *The History of the Rise, Progress, and Establishment of the Independence of the United States of America*. Four vols., London, 1788.

² About the same time, I published in the *Proceedings* of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences and Arts (Vol. XIII. 419-425), a further study of Revolutionary material, going to show that five anonymous histories, published near the time when Gordon was published, were all copied, more or less closely, from the British *Annual Register*, whose authorship, at least of the American part, has been ascribed to Edmund Burke. The titles of these volumes are as follows: *An History of the War with America, France, Spain and Holland, begun in the year 1775 and ended in 1783*. Printed in the year 1787; *An Impartial History of the War in America between Great Britain and her Colonies*. London, 1780; *The History of the War in America between Great Britain and her Colonies*. Dublin, 1779; *The History of the Origin, Rise and Progress of the War in America between Great Britain and her Colonies*. Boston, 1780; *An Impartial History of the War in America between Great Britain and the United States from its Commencement to the End of the War*. Boston, 1781. The appendix to Russell's *History of America*, London, 1778, is largely borrowed from the *Annual Register*. To the same source must be ascribed in large part the *History of the British Empire, containing an Impartial History of the Origin, Progress and Termination of the American Revolution*. By a Society of Gentlemen. Philadelphia, 1798. Serial accounts of the Revolution in the *Columbian Magazine and Monthly Miscellany*, Phila., 1790-1792, and in the *Monthly Register*, South Carolina, 1804-1805, have a like origin. Most noteworthy of these smaller histories is Murray's *Impartial History of the Present War in America*, 1778, 1779, the material of which was borrowed in large measure from the *Annual Register*.

³ The edition used was published in London, 1793.

The same was done with the letters of the other general officers, ministers of Congress, and others in public stations." He tells us further that in order to save space he does not give the authorities for the statements. He closes with the remark: "Intentional misrepresentations, I am sure there are none. If there are any from other sources, I trust they will be found in small circumstances, not affecting the substance." The three main points he makes are his preparation to write history, his reason for not giving his authorities and his assertion of his utmost effort to be accurate.¹ Unfortunately the evidence is only too clear that Ramsay plagiarized a large part of this history from either Gordon or the *Annual Register*. To show this it will be necessary only to make some parallel quotations from all these works. In the note below is given a triple quotation regarding the general situation in the American colonies at the breaking out of the Revolution.²

Ramsay is very much like Gordon in his use of the *Annual Register* for original documents or rather for second-hand summaries of them. In attempting to give the substance of the resolutions of the Suffolk County Convention he follows the *Register* so closely that he puts the wording of the 4th resolution into the close of the preamble.³ In another place he makes the Salem address to Governor Gage close with the last phrase quoted from it by

¹ "For the entire period covered by this chapter I find no narrative apparently more just or opinions more candidly expressed, than in Ramsay's *History of the American Revolution*. Remote from the scene of conflict, Ramsay shared the passions of neither party." Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History*, VI. 67. "The Revolution Impending," by Mellen Chamberlain.

² *Annual Register*, 1775, p. 10, c. 1-2.

The people of America at this time, with respect to political opinions, might in general be divided into two great classes. Of these one was for rushing headlong into the greatest extremities. . . . The other, if less numerous, was not less respectable and though more moderate was perhaps equally firm. . . .

We however acknowledge a third party which were the friends to the administration in England, or, more properly those who did not totally disapprove of its measures; but their still, small voice was so low that except in a very few particular places it could scarcely be distinguished.

Gordon, I. 378-379. The people may be divided into two great classes. One is for rushing headlong into the greatest extremities. . . . There is a third party, who are friends to the British administration, or, rather, who do not totally disapprove of its measures; but their voice is so low that except in a few particular places it can scarcely be distinguished.

Ramsay, I. 125. The inhabitants of the colonies at this time with regard to political opinions might be divided into three classes; of these one was for rushing precipitately into extremities. . . . Another party equally respectable, both as to character, property and patriotism, was more moderate but not less firm. . . . A third class disapproved of what was generally going on. . . . All these latter classes for the most part lay still, while the friends of liberty acted with spirit.

³ Ramsay, I. 128. For the resolution Boston *Evening Post*, September 19, 1774.

the *Annual Register* and by Gordon, though the phrase in question was actually at a considerable distance from the close of the address. A slight difference in wording also shows where he obtained his material.¹ In October the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts sent a memorial to General Gage. Ramsay describes the preparation and presentation of this memorial but he does not consult the contemporary newspapers or the original document. As can be seen from the memorial itself no such words as *apology* or *apologize* occur in it.² A comparison of a small portion of the accounts in the *Annual Register*, in Gordon, and in Ramsay will show the true situation.³ One further illustration from Ramsay's Massachusetts material will suffice to prove the case against him. In Gage's answer to the memorial of the Provincial Congress he said: "It is surely highly exasperating as well as ungenerous even to hint that the Lives, Liberties, or Properties of any Person except avowed Enemies are in danger from Britons; . . . It is my duty, therefore, to warn you of the rock you are upon."⁴ If we compare with this contemporary document the narrative of Ramsay we shall see that it differs strikingly from the original but resembles the *Annual Register*.⁵

Ramsay follows the *Annual Register* for his account of Burgoyne's campaign, in fact he seems to have copied the *Register* in most of the cases where Gordon had done so. The tragedy of Jane McCrea is the most striking incident of this campaign. The

¹ Ramsay, I. 124. See also Gordon, I. 374, and *Annual Register*, 1775, pp. 8-9. For the original address see *Boston Evening Post*, June 20, 1774, p. 2, c. 3.

² *Massachusetts Gazette*, October 17, 1774, pp. 2-3.

³ Memorial to Gen. Gage from Massachusetts Provincial Congress.

Annual Register, 1775, p. 20, c. 2. Among their earliest proceedings they appointed a committee to wait upon the governor with a remonstrance in which they apologized for their present meeting, by representing that the distressed and miserable state of the colony had rendered it etc.

Gordon, I. 411-412. They proceeded to appoint a committee to wait upon the governor with a remonstrance in which they apologize for their meeting, from the distressed state of the colony.

Ramsay, I. 129. One of their first acts was to appoint a committee to wait on the Governor with a remonstrance in which they apologized for their meeting, from the distressed state of the colony.

⁴ *Massachusetts Gazette*, October 24, 1774, p. 2, c. 3.

⁵ *Annual Register*, 1775, p. 21, c. 1. He expressed great indignation that an idea should be formed, that the lives, liberties or property of any people, except avowed enemies should be in danger from English troops . . . he therefore warned them of the rocks they were upon.

Ramsay, I. 129. He replied by expressing his indignation at the supposition "That the lives, liberties, or property of any people, except enemies, could be in danger from English troops" . . . He therefore warned them of the rocks they were upon.

parallel quotations in the foot-note show how Ramsay copied.¹ In the André affair a very excellent illustration is to be found of the complex plagiarism of Gordon's and Ramsay's accounts. The narrative of the *Annual Register* follows quite closely in some parts the account given by Hamilton in a letter to Col. Laurens.² We are not left to conjecture this from internal evidence for at the close a warm tribute is paid to Hamilton for the generosity of his treatment of André in this letter. Ramsay seems to have copied equally from Gordon and the *Annual Register* and does not show evidence of having had Hamilton's letter at all. The parallel passages will show these points.³ As a further illustration of Ramsay's methods of securing material we might mention the case of Arnold's letter to Washington pleading for the life of André. He very clearly does not use Arnold's letter⁴ but instead copies the very close transcript of the letter in the *Annual Register*. It is only by a close examination of the text that it becomes clear which Ramsay used, the original or the copy.⁵

As far as accounts of northern affairs were concerned it seems proved that Ramsay must be considered as wholly unreliable as an authority. There is some degree of excuse for this; but when we come into the southern states themselves we naturally expect him to depend more upon original sources, but again we are disappointed for his plagiarism is still apparent. In his account of the operations

¹ *Annual Register*, 1777, p. 156. The friends of the royal cause as well as its enemies were equally victims to their indiscriminate rage. Among other instances of this nature, the murder of Miss McCrea . . . struck every breast with horror. The young lady is represented to have been in all the innocence of youth and bloom of beauty. . . . Occasion was thence taken to exasperate the people and to blacken the royal party and army . . . they loudly condemned and reprobated that government which could call such auxiliaries into a civil contest; thereby endeavoring as they said, not to subdue but to exterminate a people whom they affected to consider and pretended to reclaim as subjects. . . . Thus an army was poured forth by the woods, mountains and marshes. . . . The Americans recalled their courage, and when their regular army seemed to be entirely wasted the spirit of the country produced a much greater and more formidable force.

Ramsay, II. 36-37. The friends of the royal cause as well as its enemies, suffered from their indiscriminate barbarities. Among other instances, the murder of Miss McCrea excited an universal horror. This young lady, in the innocence of youth and the bloom of beauty. . . . Occasion was thereby given to inflame the populace and to blacken the royal cause . . . and they loudly condemned that government which could call such auxiliaries into a civil contest as were calculated not to subdue but to exterminate a people whom they affected to reclaim as subjects. . . . An army was speedily poured forth from the woods and mountains. When they who had begun the retreat had nearly wasted away, the spirit of the country immediately supplied their place with a much greater and more formidable force.

² Hamilton to Col. Laurens, September, 1780. *Official and other Papers of the late Major-General Alexander Hamilton*, N. Y., 1842, I. 458 ff.

³ *Annual Register*, 1781, 45-46; Gordon, III. 488-490; Ramsay, II. 201.

⁴ Sparks's *Life of Washington*, VII. 541.

⁵ Compare *Annual Register*, 1781, p. 45 and Ramsay, II. 201.

of Lord Dunmore in Virginia this appears very plainly.¹ The accounts of the Revolution on the western frontier as given in Ramsay and Gordon are so similar in a number of places that it is remarkable they have not been traced back to the *Annual Register*. In Winsor we find the following: "The earliest account of the massacre at Wyoming is in a letter written at Poughkeepsie, July 20, 1778,² just after the fugitives had arrived there and this account seems to be largely the source whence Gordon, Botta and Marshall drew their accounts . . . Ramsay is reasonably accurate and is free from many errors which characterize the other narratives."³ Gordon's whole account was taken from the *Annual Register*; and it is equally clear now that Ramsay used the same source, though by abbreviating to a considerable extent he frequently obliterated almost wholly the close resemblance between his copy and the original. Strangely enough Gordon seems to have had in his hands the original account for he makes use of certain words which he could not have obtained from the *Annual Register*.

There remains to be considered the account of events in England and elsewhere out of the colonies. While Ramsay undoubtedly used the material of the *Annual Register* in compiling his accounts, in this part of his work he seems to have abbreviated much more freely, probably from lack of space. It is seldom that a half page can be found verbatim; more often stray phrases copied or whole sentences have been transcribed and appear every now and then in the midst of the abridgments. This has made it much more difficult to trace such plagiarism. A good illustration, however, of a fairly complete copy occurs in his account of Burke's speech in Parliament.⁴ In the study of Gordon's history the remark is made in connection with the parallel quotations from the *Annual Register*, Ramsay and Gordon, that Ramsay was never guilty of the gross plagiarism which had disfigured the work of Gordon. At that time the only work of Ramsay's I had studied was his history of the Revolution in South Carolina. It is evident that I must retract my first statement regarding Ramsay and place him on the same level with Gordon. The modified form which Ramsay's plagiarism takes in his earlier work makes it more difficult to secure a perfectly clear case. If we were to believe his own words, we should accept him as an unquestioned authority. In his preface he tells us of his preparation and of his sources and in conclusion says:

¹ *Annual Register*, 1776, p. 27; Ramsay, I, 249.

² Almon's *Remembrancer*, 1779, VII, 51.

³ Winsor, VI, 662-663. "The Indians and the Border Warfare of the Revolution," by Andrew McFarland Davis.

⁴ *Annual Register*, 1775, p. 105; Ramsay, I, 168.

"He declares that embracing every opportunity of obtaining genuine information, he has sought for truth, and that he has asserted nothing but what he believes to be a fact."¹ But indeed even in his *History of the Revolution of South Carolina*, we see a beginning of that plagiaristic tendency that rendered his later history so worthless. From Ramsay's account of the siege of Yorktown we extract a portion for comparison with his source.² It was one of the more serious charges against Gordon that his plagiarism was conscious on account of his rather obvious attempts to conceal evidences of borrowing. Ramsay seems to have fallen into the same practice more than once, using quotation marks in order to give the impression of a direct quotation from a document. A case of this kind occurs in the description of the siege of Yorktown.³

Ramsay's account of the battle of King's Mountain is as characteristic a piece of description as his work contains, and Gordon copied it from the manuscript of the work loaned him by the author. But even here there is a distinct copy from the *Annual Register*.⁴

¹ "His book may be regarded as an authority of the first importance." Winsor, VI. 508. "War in the Southern Department," by Edward Channing.

² *Annual Register*, 1781, p. 131. Two redoubts, which were advanced about 300 yards on the British left had greatly incommoded the enemy, and still continued to impede their progress. . . . To balance the honor, as well as the duty, between both nations, the attack on one was committed to the Americans and of the other to the French. Col. Hamilton, Washington's aid de-camp, commanded the American detachment which marched to the assault with unloaded arms; passed the abattis and palisades without waiting to remove them; and attacking the works on all sides at once, carried the redoubt with the utmost rapidity. . . . The French were equally successful on their side but their loss was more considerable . . . and the two redoubts were included in the second parallel by daylight.

Ramsay, II. 323-324. Two redoubts, which were advanced about three hundred yards on the left of the British, greatly impeded the progress of the combined armies. . . . To excite a spirit of emulation, the reduction of one was committed to the French—of the other to the Americans. The latter marched to the assault with unloaded arms, passed the abattis and palisades, and attacking on all sides, carried the redoubt in a few minutes. . . . The French were equally successful on their side . . . but lost a considerable number of men. These two works, which had heretofore embarrassed the operations of the besiegers, by being included in the second parallel, were more subservient to their ulterior designs.

³ *Annual Register*, 1781, p. 132. . . . and Hamilton, in his report to Marquis de la Fayette, boasts . . . that the soldiery under his command, incapable, as he expresses himself, of imitating examples of barbarity, and forgetting recent provocations, spared every man that ceased to resist.

Ramsay, *Revolution of South Carolina*, 324. . . . in his report of the transaction to the Marquis de la Fayette, mentioned, to the honor of his detachment, "that, incapable of imitating examples of barbarity, and forgetting recent provocations, they spared every man that ceased to resist."

Hamilton's *Works*, N. Y., 1886, VIII. 48, letter to Lafayette, Oct. 15, 1781.

"The killed and wounded of the enemy did not exceed eight. Incapable of imitating examples of barbarity, and forgetting recent provocations, the soldiery spared every man who ceased to resist."

⁴ Col. Ferguson at King's Mountain, *Annual Register*, 1781, p. 52; Ramsay, II. 185.

Ramsay must therefore be looked upon much more critically in the future than he has ever yet been in the past. He is guilty of plagiarism so commonly in one work as to condemn it as well-nigh worthless; and in another work he has plagiarized sufficiently to raise in our minds a reasonable suspicion as to his absolute trustworthiness in any portion of his published work. We cannot separate Ramsay, the consistent plagiarist of the later history, from Ramsay, the first class authority on South Carolinian history; the paradox is too striking. It is all the work of one man and one method and certainly neither can be reliable nor wholly honorable, at least from the present standpoint. Our conclusion regarding both Ramsay and Gordon must be that they are no longer authorities at first hand, but are merely discredited and doubtful contemporaries, whose accounts must be severely tested before being taken for truth. Both historians made great professions in their prefaces of having examined large numbers of manuscripts and public documents, both affirmed the impartiality and accuracy of their histories, while at the same time they were taking unverified material from a British magazine wholly without credit, copying not facts merely but the very phrases and wording of whole paragraphs and pages. Each is guilty of this in his own special field, the one in New England, the other in Southern history. Both used the same device of changing indirect discourse into direct, with quotation marks as a means of imparting more life to the narration, and possibly their purpose was, also, to conceal their plagiarism. Each copied from the other and the fault was shared mutually. They lived in a generation of successfully plagiarized histories, some of them anonymous, all of them more or less well received by an uncritical public. It is no wonder, then, that under the stress of financial need and tempted by flattering offers, they compounded with their publishers at the expense of their histories. This group of histories described in the present paper belongs quite largely to the English school and attests the power of the bond which we were thought to sever in 1776 or in 1783. Will it not be profitable, now that the last of the contemporary American historians yields his place of authority, to compile from the *Annual Register* a history of the American Revolution which shall be known for what it is under its true colors? We shall by this means ascertain more exactly what is American and what is English in the great mass of historical writing that has been accumulating for a hundred years. We need, also, it seems equally certain, an authoritative American history of our Revolutionary War.

ORIN GRANT LIBBY.

DOCUMENTS

1. *A Letter of Alexander von Humboldt, 1845.*

FOR the following letter written by Alexander von Humboldt, we are indebted to Professor George G. Wilson. It was found in the Wheaton Collection of Brown University, a collection which includes, besides books on international law and diplomacy, several thousand manuscripts on diplomatic and political affairs. The manuscripts are mostly the letters of Henry Wheaton and Jonathan Russell. The letter here given is without address, but it was doubtless written to Mr. Wheaton, who was a personal friend of Humboldt.

Encore un mot sur l'Isthme de Panama : je crois pouvoir vous en dire ce qui peut en être un jour :

M. Chevalier n'a grandement fait que copier ou traduire en d'autres phrases ce qui se trouve dans la seconde édition de mon Essai pol. sur la Nouvelle Espagne T. I. 202-248, dans la Relation historique du Voyage en 4^o, T. III, p. 117-147 et dans mon Asie Centrale (1843) T. II, 325 mais il n'a jamais touché aux véritables principes.

J'ai insisté depuis 40 ans sur la folie d'entreprendre un de ces travaux, même d'y fixer de préférence idéalement sans que les mêmes personnes examinent comparativement l'Isthme de Panama, Le Lac de Nicaragua et Guasacualco [J'ai peu de confiance en ce dernier point.]

On oublie aussi les côtes de Honduras et de Veraguas. Dans le méridien de Sonsonate le Golfo Dulce entre de 20 lieues dans les terres ; du village de Zacapa à la Mer du Sud il n'y a que 21 lieues. (Voyage, T. III, p. 127.)

Règle générale : Tout canal à un grand nombre d'écluses n'est pas océanique, ne peut servir aux grandes opérations maritimes de l'Europe et des Etats-Unis. Il ne s'agit pas de cabotage mais de navires qui, partant de Liverpool ou de New York, doivent aller à Canton, à Lima, à St. Francisco en Californie. De nombreuses écluses comme celles du Canal Caledonien n'arrêtent pas seulement la navigation, et peuvent manquer d'eau dans certaines saisons : elles deviennent aussi cause de maladie pour les marins.

Un canal océanique à cause des rapports avec le Chili et la Californie est beaucoup plus important pour les Etats-Unis qu'il ne l'est pour l'Europe. On continuerait même quand l'Isthme de Panama serait percé à aller de Liverpool à Calcutta par le Cap de Bonne Espérance, mais on

se servirait de l'Isthme pour Macao, Canton, les îles Sandwich et la Nouvelle Hollande.

Le percement d'un Isthme augmentera puissamment le pouvoir politique des Etats-Unis dans la Mer du Sud. Les négociations avec la Chine auront aussi un appui militaire plus prompt si le canal existe. La Chine deviendra plus faible vis-à-vis l'Europe et les Etats-Unis.

Les opérations très exactes qu'à ma pensée le général Doliver a fait exécuter en 1828 et 1829 par votre compatriote Lloyd et par le Suédois Falmarc ont prouvé qu'entre Portobelo, Cruzes et Panama le point culminant a la hauteur de 633 pieds anglais au-dessus du niveau des deux mers, qui est probablement le même. Le détail de l'opération a été publié dans les *Philosophical Transactions* for 1830, p. 84. J'avais supposé en 1804 la hauteur de l'arête, en ne me fondant que sur des considérations de température et de géographie des plantes, à 550 pieds.

Depuis ce travail de Lloyd et Falmarc la maison de commerce de M. Salomon à la Martinique a envoyé depuis 5-6 ans des ingénieurs à l'Isthme de Panama pour chercher un point où la petite arête montueuse est plus basse. Ces ingénieurs ont douté des cartes qui m'ont été soumises. Ils ont prétendu qu'à l'ouest de la ligne du nivellement de Lloyd il y avait une dépression de l'arête si considérable que le canal n'avait qu'à franchir une hauteur de 45 pieds de mer en mer. On comptait faire une taille à ciel ouvert, une coupure de montagnes. M. Salomon est depuis plusieurs années à Paris (Place Breda, n. 10). C'est un homme estimable qui m'a souvent soumis ses plans. Il n'a pas été lui-même sur les lieux mais M. Joly de Sable que j'ai vu aussi. Comme une partie du nivellement paraissait exécutée par le baromètre et que ce moyen nécessite des précautions particulières, j'ai eu des doutes sur le résultat. J'étais surpris qu'un fait de cette haute importance ne fixât pas d'avantage, pendant 3-4 ans, l'attention des peuples maritimes. Il était si peu coûteux d'envoyer des ingénieurs de la Jamaïque à Portobelo pour vérifier les mesures. J'en ai souvent parlé avec chaleur à M. Guizot. Il paraît que la triste occupation d'Otaheite a fait accroître l'intérêt, plus politique peut-être que mercantile. Le choix de l'ingénieur Gavella paraissait excellent. C'est un homme employé longtemps à des nivellements dans les Pyrénées. Il renie les résultats de la maison Salomon, mais je n'ai pas vu clairement dans l'extrait du rapport, si le nivellement de M. Gavella a été fait sur les mêmes points. Les projets de M. Gavella autant que je m'en souviens sont des plus chimériques. Il trouve vraisemblablement entre Portobelo et Panama (car on a la fureur de ne pas partir de cette région!!) une hauteur moindre que celle de Lloyd, je crois, de 4-500 pieds et pour avoir moins d'écluses il veut percer un immense tunnel de plusieurs lieues de longueur. Son orifice est placé à une telle hauteur que des deux côtés il faut encore 30-40 écluses! Ceci est une folie et non un canal océanique utile à la grande navigation.

La maison Salomon en attendant a formé une compagnie pour établir un chemin de fer qui peut être d'un intérêt secondaire. J'ai exposé la mesure de cet intérêt. (des railways) Voyage, T. III, p. 121.

Je me tue à exprimer et à dire que l'Isthme de Panama doit être parcouru, examiné par 3-4 personnes à la fois dans toute la partie à l'est et au sud-est de la ligne de Panama à Portobelo, où le Golfe de Mandinga, appelé aussi Golfe de San Blas, rétrécit l'Isthme. Il est certain qu'entre l'Ensenada de Cupica qui se trouve sur mes cartes (ensenada de la Mer du Sud) et les bouches du Rio Atrato la Cordillère de la Nouvelle Grenade disparaît. La carte 63 (carte de Colombia) de l'Atlas de Brue vous offre ces positions. Elle est copiée sur mon Atlas.¹

Le capitaine Cochrane (*Journals of a residence and travels in Colombia during 1822 and 1824*, T. II, p. 448) qui a passé de mer en mer là où passaient de mon temps les couriers de Lima à Carthagena de Indias n'a trouvé que 3 rangées de petites collines. Cette disparition de la Cordillère rend géologiquement très probable que dans [la] partie orientale de l'Isthme, là où l'Isthme se joint au continent de l'Amérique méridionale, entre le Golfe de Mandinga et le Golfe de San Miguel, l'arête formant le point culminant s'abaisse rapidement. Cette partie n'a été aucunement examinée sous le point de vue de la canalisation. Je l'ai indiqué à M. Salomon pour en parler dans un prospectus qu'il allait publier sur son railway de l'Isthme. (mai, 1845.)

Il paraît que les Belges vont en avant avec leur compagnie du Canal de Nicaragua. J'espère que vous avez vu ma Notice sur l'Amérique et les communications avec la Mer du Sud (12^{me} clause) que j'ai insérée dans la Gazette de Spener il y a 6-7 jours. Vous y trouverez des choses qui vous intéressent.

Mille affectueux et respectueux hommages.

BER. 6 Dec., 1845.

A. V. HUMBOLDT.

2. *English Policy Toward America in 1790-1791.*

(*First Installment.*)

THE following documents, obtained from the English Public Record Office, illustrate England's American policy in 1790-1791, particularly at the period of the Nootka Sound episode. In the summer of 1789 Spain seized certain English ships which were on their way to establish a trading post at Nootka Sound. In the spring and summer of 1790 active preparations were made for war by both nations. France, denying the applicability of the family compact to her new situation, failed to render the effective support on which Spain relied, and a convention between England and Spain was signed October 28, 1790. In the intermediate period the United States was vitally affected.² At that time England retained the northwestern posts and encouraged the Indians to hold the Ohio River—indeed Lord Dorchester had apprehensions that Harmor's expedition against the Indians was intended against the Brit-

¹ This last sentence is a marginal note in the original.

² See Worthington C. Ford's *The United States and Spain in 1790*. Brooklyn, 1890.

ish post at Detroit. Expecting trouble and doubting the ability of the Union to hold the west, Lord Dorchester had for several years past been securing information on the attitude of the western settlers toward English control.¹ On April 17, 1790, the Lords of the Privy Council for Trade, wrote to Mr. Grenville, the Secretary of State for Home Affairs, that Vermont and the western settlements should be treated on the same basis; a liberal policy of commercial concession should be adopted, and "in a commercial view it will be for the Benefit of this Country to prevent Vermont and Kentucke and all the other settlements now forming in the Interior parts of the great Continent of North America, from becoming dependent on the Government of the United States, or on that of any other Foreign Country, and to preserve them on the contrary in a State of Independence, and to induce them to form Treaties of Commerce and Friendship with Great Britain."² This was the policy that Spain was contemporaneously applying to the leaders of Kentucky and Tennessee. Supporting the Creeks, Cherokees and other Indians of the Gulf region against American advance, and denying to the settlers the right to navigate the Mississippi, Spain intrigued with Wilkinson and her other pensioners in the West to secure the independency of Kentucky and Tennessee under Spanish protection.³ The United States tried to detach McGillivray, the Creek leader, from Spain by engaging him in a treaty at New York which was completed August 7, 1790.⁴ But McGillivray was associated in the Indian trade with the Scotch firm of Pantou, Leslie and Co., of Pensacola, who had obtained from Spain the right to this trade by an arrangement under which Spain received £12,000 a year.⁵ McGillivray, therefore, kept in touch with Spain in spite of his American treaty, and at the same time explained to England that his action depended upon the fact that he saw that from the local situation of the Indians they could not expect effectual sup-

¹ See Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, III. 129, n. 2; Winsor, *Westward Movement*, 350, 367, 389 ff.; Marshall, *Kentucky*; Butler, *Kentucky*; Green, *Spanish Conspiracy*, 292, 299; Gayarre, *Louisiana under Spanish Domination*, p. 235; and the sources in *Calendar Virginia State Papers*, IV. 555; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, pp. 106, 108, 109, 131 ff.; Elliot's *Debates*, V. 97, 98, 100; *Draper Collection*: Clark MSS.—Trip 1860, vi., p. 190. Thomas Marshall, of Kentucky, wrote to Washington in 1789 that Wilkinson had warned the governor of Louisiana in 1787 of the feasibility of the united British and Americans taking Louisiana and thence advancing to New Mexico in twenty days, and had urged "the great danger the Spanish interest in North America would be in from the British power, should that nation possess herself of the mouth of the Mississippi and thereby hold the two grand portals of North America, that river and the St. Lawrence." Butler, *Kentucky* (1836), appendix, p. 519.

² Chatham, MSS., Bdle. 343. Compare *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, p. 132.

³ On McGillivray see Fickett, *Alabama*, II. 30 *et passim*.

⁴ *American St. Papers, Ind. Aff.*, I. 81. ⁵ *Rep. on Can. Ar.*, 1890, p. 153.

port from her. McGillivray's rival among these Indians was William Augustus Bowles,¹ son of a Maryland planter who, in the Revolution, joined the British and served in the Floridas. Dismissed from the army, he went the Indians, adopted their costume, and built up a large following in opposition to McGillivray,² by securing goods through clandestine trade with the British West Indies. His memoirs give him a most romantic career, as portrait-painter, actor and forest diplomat, and relate how he led the Indians in the English service in the final operations against the Spaniards of Florida, in the Revolutionary War. In his London correspondence, in 1791, with Grenville he mentions that he is a half-pay officer in the British army. He had gone from the Bahamas to Quebec with some Cherokee chiefs, and Lord Dorchester had permitted him to present his case in person to the English government. In his letter to Grenville, Lord Dorchester suggested that these Indians' resentment against the states, arising from injudicious encroachments upon their territory, might be appeased by ensuring them a more liberal treatment under the King's protection. The party did not reach London until Spain and England had made peace, but Bowles nevertheless presented the memorial here, printed and, on the 7th of March following, Grenville wrote to Dorchester:

"Such of their requests as related to views of hostility against the United States have met with no kind of encouragement, but they will in some degree be gratified in their wish of intercourse with the British Dominions by an admission to the free posts [ports?] in His Majesty's West Indian Islands, supposing that they should find themselves in a situation to avail themselves of this indulgence."³

The distinction which Bowles gained from his British connection is shown in the report of Indian Commissioner Seagrove in 1792, after Bowles had been taken by the Spaniards.⁴ He says:

"Although Bowles is removed, such is the baneful effect of what he has done, that the strength of his party (even at this moment) in the Creek nation, is such, that we find General McGillivray compelled to submit to their will."

Bowles was enticed by the Spaniards into their hands in 1792, but was afterwards released and returned to give trouble to the

¹ On Bowles's career, besides the documents that follow, see *Authentic Memoirs of William Augustus Bowles, Esq.*, etc., London, 1791; Perin du lac, *Voyage*, etc., ch. 52, p. 456; Milfort, *Sejour dans la Nation Creek*; Pickett, *Alabama*, II. 115; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, pp. xlii, 153 ff.; *American State Papers, Ind. Aff.*, I. 264, 295-299, 304, 651.

² *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, p. 153. In this interview in 1790, McGillivray gives his version of the actions of Bowles and of his lieutenant, Dalton.

³ *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, p. xlii.

⁴ *American State Papers, Ind. Aff.*, I. 296; cf. 264. See also Jefferson, *Writings* (1895), V. 404, and Washington, *Writings*, XII. 159.

house of Panton.¹ England disavowed his pretensions and he was again seized by Spain and died in prison in 1804.

The interest of England in the Florida possessions which she had so recently lost was not unnatural and Pitt's desire to recover his "Southern Farms" finds illustration in this material. But the most significant documents are those which deal with Miranda.² After the American Revolution this remarkable man, visiting the United States, England, Prussia, Russia, and France, succeeded in interesting the great leaders of these countries in his plans. He attracted Hamilton by his great scheme of South American Revolution; he corresponded with Frederick the Great; was patronized by Catharine; won Pitt's adhesion to his ideas in 1790 and again in 1796; and interested Brissot, Le Brun, and Dumouriez in his plan for revolutionizing Spanish America in 1792.³ This was followed by the attempt of Genet to secure Louisiana and Florida. The relations of Miranda to Pitt and to leading American Federalists like Hamilton and Rufus King in the period 1796-1798 cannot be here considered, nor the closely tangled web of intrigue that was woven by England, France, Spain and American frontiersmen like Senator Blount for the possession of the approaches to the Mississippi valley in the years that preceded the Louisiana Purchase. After his unsuccessful attempts at stirring up South American revolt in 1806 and 1810, Miranda died in prison at Cadiz in 1816. The significance of the documents presented in this connection lies in part in their evidence that in 1790 under Miranda's influence military preparations were inaugurated by England which had for one of their objective points the city of New Orleans, and more remotely Mexico and South America.

The attitude of Washington's government toward the Nootka Sound episode is highly interesting both because it was the first serious question of high diplomacy that engaged the new government, and even more because it gave occasion for Jefferson definitely to formulate a policy with respect to the control of the Mississippi which affected his subsequent attitude at the time of the Louisiana Purchase. During July and August, Beckwith, Dor-

¹ For the later career of Bowles see *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, p. xlii.

² Recent publications have cast new light on Miranda. See AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III. 654, 674; VI. 509. The last reference gives Popham's survey of Miranda's career, based on interviews with him. Hubert Hall, Esq., of the Public Record Office, presents in the *Athenaeum* for April 19, 1902 (p. 498), a valuable study of the relations between Pitt and Miranda based on the Chatham Papers, portions of which are, by Mr. Hall's kind assistance, here first printed. Compare the older work, Antepara, *South American Emancipation and the Edinburgh Review*, January, 1809 (xiii, 295).

³ For French designs on Spanish lands in North America at the period of Genet's mission, see AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III. 654, 490, and *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, p. 930, and 1897, p. 569.

chester's agent, was holding conversations with leading members of the Federal Government, and especially with Hamilton, who asserted our determination to control New Orleans.¹ Jefferson, alarmed at the prospect of England's control of Louisiana and Florida, wrote in July to Monroe: "Embraced from St. Croix to St. Mary's on one side by their possessions, on the other by their fleet, we need not hesitate to say that they would soon find means to unite to them all the territory covered by the ramifications of the Mississippi," and he looked forward to "bloody and eternal war or indissoluble confederacy" with England.² In case of combined action he hoped that the United States would receive the Floridas and New Orleans, leaving Louisiana to England. Upon our representative in Spain he urged the propriety of convincing that nation that England was a dangerous neighbor to Mexico, and that Spain's safest policy would be to cede us the navigation of the Mississippi, and all territory east of it on condition that we should guarantee to her all her possessions on the western waters of that river.³

On August 23d, Secretary Knox instructed Governor St. Clair to assure the British that Harmar's expedition was not against their posts. On the 26th Washington issued a proclamation against invasion of the Indian lands in the southwest, in opposition to the proposed colonization by the Yazoo company. Having thus guarded against trouble with England and Spain, on August 27th, Washington asked the opinions of his cabinet, and the Vice President, upon the answer to be given in case Dorchester asked permission to march troops across our territory from Detroit to the Mississippi, or what should be done if this were undertaken without leave. The replies to this interesting query varied. Hamilton would sooner grant permission than risk hostility and the loss of the west;⁴ Jefferson would avoid answer, but permit the passage if necessary;⁵ Adams would give a dignified refusal and if England crossed, await indemnity.⁶

The outcome made it unnecessary to choose sides on the momentous questions involved in the Nootka Sound episode, but the possession of the Mississippi valley, the Gulf of Mexico, and the choice of European allies seemed for a time at stake.

I desire to express my thanks to Hubert Hall, Esq., of the Public Record Office, for his skill and courtesy, in enabling me to procure these documents.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

¹ *Rep. Can. Ar.*, 1890, pp. xxxv, 160-164, 276-278, and Hamilton, *Works*, IV. 5, 32, 66.

² Jefferson, *Writings*, V. 198, 199, 225. These papers constitute an admirable view of the whole problem of our relations to Spanish America and England at that time.

³ Jefferson, *Writings*, V. 229, ff.; compare his propositions to Short, the *chargé d'affaires* in France, *ibid.*, p. 218, and to G. Morris, our agent in England, p. 224.

⁴ Hamilton, *Works*, IV. 20, 66.

⁵ Jefferson, *Writings*, V. 238.

⁶ Adams, *Works*, VIII. 497.

[*Miranda's Plans.*]

I. P. ALLAIRE [R. D.] TO SIR GEORGE YONGE, M. P.¹

Sir

Since my last a Vessel has Arrived from New Orleans with an Accot. that the Inhabitants of Mexico have taken Arms and possessed themselves of the Mines that the Governor sent 2000 Soldiers to Retake them which were Repulsed. the Insurgents were than 7000 strong—Liberty spreads her Wings from East to West

I remain with the Utmost Respect

Sir,

Your V. H. Servt

P. ALLAIRE

New York 6 Feb 1790

II. FRANCISCO DE MIRANDA TO WILLIAM PITT.²

Sir:

Having perhaps been importunate to you without wishing it, in fact by the repetition of my letters and messages to you, upon the final termination of my settlement in this Country, as the retard was become rather disagreeable to me I shall take the liberty to recapitulate here as in one point of view, all that has passed on my affairs. It will ease my mind and may serve you as a memorandum (if necessary) in order to facilitate the expedition of this business, which you have certainly given me every reason to suppose, is determined and decided.

When my friend Governor Pownall³ proposed, and explained to you the *grand Plan* I had to communicate to the British minister for the advantages and interest of the English nation, united to those of South America, it was accepted as a measure certainly to be adopted in case of a War with Spain—and in this supposition I was desired to wait upon you at Hollwood where I had the honour to meet you by appointment on the 14th February 1790—There we had a very long conference upon the subject, in which, the nature of my Proposals; the new form of Gov-

¹ F. O. America H. The address is known from the endorsement.

² Chatham MSS.

³ For reference to Pownall's previous plans, see AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III. 328.

⁴ In the Chatham MSS. Bdle. 345, undated, but with Miranda's papers of 1790 is a plan for a constitution for the Spanish American colonies. The boundaries included on the north the line passing by the middle of the Mississippi from its mouth to its source, and thence continued straight toward the west by the forty-fifth degree of north latitude to the Pacific. On the east the line was the Atlantic Ocean from Cape Horn to the Gulf of Mexico and thence to the mouth of the Mississippi, but Brazil and Guiana were not included nor the islands along the coast, except Cuba "since the port of Havana is the key to the Gulf of Mexico." The government was to be mixed and adapted to that of Great Britain. The executive power was to be lodged in an Inca, under the title of Emperor with hereditary succession. The upper chamber was to be composed of senators or caziques nominated by the Inca for life. Detailed provisions were made for elections and for local chambers and courts. Compare Pownall's scheme.

ernment²—intended to be introduced in South-America, my Personal circumstances, and actual situation etc. were fully explained, and the Whole admitted as a Plan beneficial to this Country and to be put in execution certainly in case only of a War with Spain.—Upon this Condition and Solemn promise I was desired by you to write down, either in English or French all the purport of our Conversation, adding a Statement of the whole produces of South America, the Exports and imports from Spain, the military and naval forces in both countrys, their Population etc. and to forward it to you with proper safety—which I did on the 5th March 1790. with as much accuracy and detail as I possibly could.

On the 6 of May next I received a *Note* from you by your private Secretary Joseph Smith Esq. requesting to meet you that night if possible at 9. o clock.—And in consequence I had the honour to wait upon you at White-hall, where you did me the favour besides of introducing me to the Secretary of State Mr. Grenville (now Lord Grenville).—We had a long conference—upon the subject of the preparations for a War with Spain, in consequence of the occurrences at Nootka Sound. The disposition of the People in South America towards joining the English for their independency against the Spaniards etc. And you thanked me for the Papers I had sent to you, shewing them to me in a green-box you had by you, in going to meet the Cabinet Council. Giving me new assurances of the Execution of my *Plans* if unfortunately a War as it apiered should take place between the two Countrys.—And pointing to me the same chanel of Mr. Smith, to convey with safety any thing I might think worth communicating to you.

Various interviews took place at your House in Downing Street, in the time that the great Armament, and Spanish negociations were going on; in which I explicitly desired that a sufficient annual suport should be granted to me (as a *loan* only, till I could come to the possession of my property when I meant to repay every thing advanced to me) being now deprived of all income from my Estate in South America and having given up all my Commissions and Connection with the Court of Madrid; even with the Spanish Ambassador Marquis del Campo.—You, then was pleased to say, that in three or four weeks you should be able to answer my request; and that any sum of money I should want in

In the Chatham MSS. Bdle. 345, is also the draft of a proclamation, dated August 3, 1790, to be issued to the inhabitants of South America on the landing of an expeditionary force. It offers certain articles containing proposals for a continental government. Amnesty was offered to those who wished to leave. The officials were to be bona fide citizens, including a governor (a native noble) for five years, an elective supreme council for a term of four years, the regidors and alcaldes to be continued. The inquisition was to be abolished, the clergy to retain the tithes and the clerical courts. The revenue was to be continued, but collected by natives. The law courts were to be composed of natives. The governor and council might employ military and naval forces, and were to be authorized to make a treaty of federal alliance and commerce with Great Britain and with all powers that should recognize the independence of the country. For the time all legislative power was to be vested in the governor and council.

the meantime you was ready to supply me with, and that I should hear from you in two or three days there upon—I never received any money, which might be owing to circumstances I am not acquainted with.

Some time after, I presented to you the *Plan of Government* and mode of Legislation, I thought proper to be introduced in South America according to the principles of *Freedom* and *Independency*, we had agreed upon as a fundamental principle¹—You seemed pleased with it, and begged to leave it with you for the farther perusal, and consideration. We proceeded talking about the Plan of carrying on the War, and attacking the Spaniards in America, wishing me to point out the *places* by which it should be necessary to begin . . . I said that it was a matter of very great importance; and that I had considered the Subject in general very much, I had not brought it yet to that precision that it required; but in a few days I should be ready to answer the question fully. I suggested at the same time other efficacious measures; such as engaging a few of the Ex-Jesuits natives of South America and now exiled by the King of Spain in the Pope's dominions; whose names and place of abode I had with me and was very sure might be engaged for such a noble purpose. You earnestly adopted the measure requesting me to send you the information without any loss of time which I did immediately, transmitting to you the names and places of residence of 300 of them that were alive in the year 1786 when I visited Italy. I forwarded also to you at the same time, by your Request, all my private Papers concerning the two last insurrections hapened at *Lima* and *Santa Fee* both in the year 1781; which authentic documents might give you the most satisfactory account of the minds and disposition of the People towards the Spanish Government; the strength and number of the militia; small force of the regular Troops; and every thing hapened at those two curious events; which shew plainly how ripe the general mass of the people was for emancipation, if the delicate points of their *Religion* and *independency* is one properly explained and

Few days after I waited upon you with my *Plan of Attack*, and *Operations* digested; and I had the honour to shew to you the Whole upon the Maps and private Plans I had with me, to your satisfaction; leaving with you the Plan and defenses of the Havana by your Request.—You did not mention, then, any thing to me relative to my previous demand of an annual support, tho' the promised term had expired; and only repeated the offer of any money I should want, which I never had received nor requested again. You asked me besides, if the Marquis del Campo had not made lately any advances to me? I answer'd that with the present views, I had given up all my pretensions in the Court of Madrid, and never had seen D. Bernardo del Campo since I wrote last to the Count de Florida blanca, and to his Catholic Majesty the present King, some time previous to those last disagreements with England ratifying my anterior resignation.

Not long after, the Convention with Spain arrived and of course every

¹ See the note above, p. 711.

progress in the intended operations was stoped.—Not hearing from you three months after, I applied for an interview, wishing to settle my affairs in any mode whatsoever, you answered me by your Secretary Mr. Smith, that you should wish to know, and have delivered in writing, which were my future views.—I presented them and my Terms the next day in a note dated the 28th January 1791, in which I stated “That my views now and allways were to promote the hapiness and liberty of my own Country (South America) excessively oppressed and in so doing to offer also great Commercial advantages to Great Britain. . . . That upon these principles I should be very hapy to offer, and continue my services to England. . . . That my personal situation required, I should mention a competent annual suport till I could [come in] to the possession of my property in Caracas, wher I would pay any sums of money that might be granted to me on any account whatsoever. . . . That the intention being purely Patriotic with the wishes only of producing services to my Country, and promoting the interest and advantages of Great-britain as perfectly compatible ;—services ought not to be requested from me against Spain, with any other motive ; being a point of delicacy with me, tho’ authorized by the right of nations, and the example of many great and virtuous men, in modern and antient times etc.

To this note I received no answer ; till the month of May last that you favoured me with an audience—in which you told me, that you had read and considered my Note, and was pleased to make some apology for the retard of my Affairs, being convinced I deserved well from this country, and had just Claims ; that the Roman Catholic Religion was an obstacle for holding employment but that you could not yet speak to me deffinitely, and desired me to wait three or four weeks more ; in which term, you should be able certainly to decide everything upon the subject.—I remonstrated to you, the length of time I had been waiting for this answer, the uncertainty I was under of any permanent settlement yet agreeable with my wishes:—the generous and magnanimous offers her Majesty the Empress of Russia¹ had made to me when I visited her Court in the year 1787 (and under whose protection I was at that very moment, by her gracious orders in a Circular and most honorific Letter to her Ambassadors and Ministers in Europe) which magnanimity was the only resource left to me now, if this country contrary to my well grounded expectations, should not take proper care of me, as I had the honor to explain it to you in our former conversations, when on Request I stated to you the sum which her I. Majesty was disposed to settle upon me in Russia viz 1000 Louis d’or per an : —and so I conceived to be highly imprudent in me to defer a moment my departure to Petersbourg, if I could not depend upon a certainty here, on my proposed terms.—You desired me notwithstanding to wait that period, giving me your *Word of honour* that I should not be disapointed any farther ; and that you would send me directly 1000 £.s to pay my previously incurred expenses.

¹ See Antepara, and AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VI, 510.

In about three months after, I received an official message from you by the Secretary Mr. Smith (July the 10th) sending me 500 £ and a *promise* to conclude certainly *in a very few days all my other future arrangements*.—With this formal *decision*, that, I *must* consider as an acceptance of my proposed Terms, I gave up my intended Voyage, to Petersburgh, and wrote to my friends in consequence. If I have troubled you since, wishing for the final formal settlement soon, which as you was pleased to say, would have taken place in a few days, it is because the delays I had experienced before made me uneasy—and I am sure, you will not be surprised at it, considering I am a foreigner here, and placed in adventitious circumstances.

As your Secretary Mr. Smith is going abroad, and you, Sir, as I understand to Weymouth, I propose myself, for relaxation, to take a tour to Scotland and Ireland, and to be back in December next, relying entirely upon your kindness, honour and liberality for my future settlement, in a maner agreeable to me; and that the sum of 1200 £s per an. (that I wish should be advanced to me as a *loan* on the terms mentioned above) should not be deamed an excessive competency, for a foreign gentleman to live *in this Country*; and if in the course of few days (I may suppose 6) I receive no answer to this Leter I shall consider your silence as a tacit confirmation of the above, and as an aprobation of my journey.—I take the liberty to mention to you *Mr. Turnbull* of Devonshire Square, a particular friend of mine, by whom any of your orders may be conveyed to me with safety and dispatch, as I shall constantly write to him:—and he shall be a proper person also to receive (as soon as convenient) the 500 £ reste of the mentioned sum I was to have received or any other advanced income; being, for want of it incomoded, especially to defray the expenses of my intended Journey.¹

I hope you will excuse this unavoidable trouble—and be convinced of my warmest wishes for the prosperity of England, whose glory I expect to see increased yet, by the executions of my proposed Plans:—and even before that period arrives, I flater myself that I may have opportunitys to prove my sincere atachment to this Country

I have the honour to be, with the greatest respect and regard Sir,
Your most obed^t. and most hum^l. Servant

FRANCISCO DE MIRANDA

LONDON Jermyn Str. 2. 47

September 8. 1791

The Right Hon^l. William Pitt.

¹ On September 7, 1792 Pitt informed Grenville: "The 800 / about which you enquire was for Miranda and Smith has his receipt. . . ." Fortescue Papers, II, *British Historical MSS. Com., Report*, V, p. 310.

III. SIR ARTHUR CAMPBELL TO WILLIAM PITT.¹

Upper Harley Street 28th Oct. 1790

Dear Sir

Major Blomhart has not yet arrived from Guernsey but in the course of my looking out for others who would give me information regarding the present State of New Orleans I was fortunate enough to fall in with one Winfrees a Captain in Blomhart's corps, who served with him in all his difficulties and ill treatment under the Spaniard last War. Winfrees lives in one of the Bahama Islands and has had late letters from his friends in the Neighbourhood of New Orleans informing him of their dislike to the Spaniards, and that, if it was to be a Spanish War and that they would have two or three British Ships of War stationed in the Mouth of the Mississippi, they would undertake not only to make themselves Masters of New Orleans but to sweep the whole Spaniards in that quarter to the Rivers mouth.

I have desired Winfrees to let me know the name of those he had a Dependence upon for raising men and the Numbers each would raise on any Sudden emergency if wanted; and hope to have it in my power to acquaint you of it in the course of a couple of days at furthest. I put it on the footing of bringing their names early in view for commissions in case there should be a War with Spain which was still very Doubtful.

I think it my duty to lay before you a Memorandum on the Subject of marching troops from New Orleans to Mexico, an Idea which does not appear to me safe, nor in any degree promising success at this hour.

I have the honour to be, with great respect,

Dear Sir,

Yours Most Faith^l

The Right Hon^{ble}

William Pitt &c &c &c

humble Servant

ARCH^d CAMPBELL

¹Chatham MSS. Bdle. 120. In the Chatham MSS., Bdle. 345, is a long memorandum unsigned, dated November 26, 1803, from some officer to Pitt. It begins by referring to the situation in 1790 and states that if war had then broken out an expedition would have been sent to Spanish America, one part under command of Sir Archibald Campbell, and the other of the writer, who was consulted by Campbell. There was to be co-operation from India. The writer refers to the projects and influence of General Miranda, who is well known to him as also his plans. Alexander Hamilton warned Lord Dorchester's agent, Beckwith, in the summer of 1790 that the United States looked forward to the possession of New Orleans. *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, pp. xxxviii, 149, 161-165; Hamilton, *Works* (1885), IV. 5, 32, 66. Scott, a member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania, suggested to Beckwith that England should take New Orleans, aided by operations on the upper Mississippi by American troops under General Knox, "and, this effected, to conduct an Army to be formed in the Western Country by land from thence into Spanish America." *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, p. 147; compare the documents on Bowles and the Floridas. Popham's outline of Miranda's career given in AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VI. 509, alleges that shortly after the American Revolution, before going to Europe, Miranda received assurances from Washington, Knox and Hamilton, that New England troops should assist him if Great Britain gave aid with her navy. It is probable that Popham's statement is an error, but the later connection between Miranda and Hamilton is well known. On Jefferson's attitude at this time see the introduction to these documents.

IV. MEMORANDUM

Enclosure

October 28th 1790

Upon an examination of the distance from New Orleans to the Town of Mexico by the shortest Route according to Mensuration taken upon several different Maps I find it is not less than Twelve hundred English Miles.

On the supposition that there was a tolerable good road along this Tract, and that an Army even without Artillery were to march continually at the rate of fifteen miles per day, it could only be accomplished in the space of Eleven weeks or Seventy Seven days. If to this circumstance is added the number of horses, mules or bullocks necessary to carry tents baggage, provisions, Stores, Medicines and Ammunition, for such an Army, it may be readily conceived that the difficulties to be surmounted in the execution of a march of this nature will be much greater than is at present attended to, even if it was certain that the natives of those Countries through which the Troops were to pass, were in a State of friendship with us. But as that is not the case, and as the Districts through which the Troops must pass, have not yet been explored by any person on whom a confidence can be placed, I should think from all the information I can at present collect, either from Maps or from Men who have been in North America that the march of an Army from New Orleans to Mexico through Savannahs and Forrests so little known to us may be attended with the most fatal consequences at this Juncture.

A. C.

[*Bowles and the Floridas.*]

V. OCCURRENCES FROM 5TH JULY TO 3D AUGUST 1790.¹

McGillevray the Indian Chief of Several of the Southern Tribes of Indians arrived here the 24th Ulto accompanied by Twenty Nine Kings Chiefs and head Men of different Nations to fix on the Boundaries between them and the United States, they are much caressed and great attention is paid to them when any treaty is formed. Your Agent in Canada shall have timely notice that he may order Goods out accordingly, or remove where he thinks it may be most for the Interest of the concerned. . . .

Your favour of the 3d June I have safe, in Answer thereto, we are to poor to partake of your Offer nor is it a time *for them* to enter into disputes with foreign Powers, having almost as much to do as the French National Assembly: We are far from being a Settled Nation at present the Southern Members forming one of,² the Northern Members, another party in both Houses, their chief aim³ is selling³ the Individual States debts to be paid by the Union, a mere flea bite but yet it has occupied their Attention for Months and created great ill will amongst them.

¹ F. O. America H. Information by the secret agent who gives his name as R. D. in the despatches, and as P. Allaire, in his private communications to the English ministers; he writes from New York.

² And?

³ Settling?

But with your permission I will inform you what I think may be done with certainty.

From 5 to 7000 Men may be had from the Western Country that would assist any Nation to take the Floridas from the Spaniards on Condition they¹ the Western Territory should have a free Navigation of the Mississippi, it is now in your power (If a War with Spain is Actually begun tho by Recent Accounts they have ask^d. Pardon) to bind us in Adamantine Chains of Friendship and Alliance with you—take the Floridas Open a free Navigation of the Mississippi for the Western Inhabitants, and you bind that Country and its Inhabitants for Ever in spite of Congress, or all the world, for without the Mississippi, its fruitfulness is useless, a few frigates and 2000 men would retake it in three Weeks and if proper means were made use of I would engage for a sufficient Number to Assist, those People are not as yet subject to the Laws of the Union, they are at present a large body of People, governed by local Laws of their own forming and propose being part of the Union on certain Conditions, as a proof of which, they undertake Expeditions against the Indians, destroy them and add their Lands to their possessions, they have drove away two Spanish posts of 30 and 25 Men and I [?] have demanded² and obtained a free Navigation for their produce, this has been done contrary to the Express Order of Congress, if therefore proper mode is made use of, which I will communicate. If you order it nothing so Easily done as your Regaining the Floridas, your Answr. to this, must be in the Mercantile Stile, which I shall fully comprehend.³ A due consideration of the Above may lead to matters of the greatest Importance to both Parties, for they are Men desperate in principal and fortune, and would almost undertake impossibilities to acquire a few thousand Spanish Dollars.

You may rest assured nothing can be done with this Government at present. No offer would tempt them at present to Enter into a War, nor is the Animosity of the leading Men yet so entirely forgot against the English as to induce them to join in a War with them We are a Strange Nation, English principals and Roman Ideas, every Man of £100 a year is a Souverain Prince every Mechanick a Man of an Independent principal there is no distinction amongst us today. Speaker of the Assembly or President of the Senate tomorrow the same Men, one a Carpenter, the other a Grocer, thus we jog on.

VI. OCCURRENCES FROM 6 AUGUST TO 1 SEPTEMBER, 1790.

Your last letters of April and May came safe to hand and have been carefull perused Read and digested and the following is my Opinion founded on Experience, knowledge and Acquaintance with those they may be concerned. Should a War breake out between you and S[pain]

¹ That.

² Possibly an error of the copyist. The *I* is apparently superfluous.

³ Note the light cast on the next correspondence "in the mercantile stile."

and you are willing to Reposes your Southern Farms,¹ I am confident you may easily Recover them with 2000 (Pounds) Men and a few Men of War, by timely notice you may rest assured that an Equal Number from the Western Territory will join you, not by order, consent or Approval, of the United States, but by those who Acknowledge Allegiance to NONE. Men, hardy, inured to fatigue and danger, expert Marksmen who live by hunting and who have for these last five Years lived Constantly in the Western Woods and who are as constantly attacking and Attackd. by the Indians, these Men in my opinion (*for the purpose*) are equal to any 5000 sent from Europe: they want the free Navigation of the River, they want the lands along the River and Above all they Want Employ being most of them destitute of Clothes and Money and the Major part of them were Soldiers during the War against England, Many of the best officers in the American Army have retired there and would prefer *Employment* to farming where every Requisite is wanting: besides the Acquisition of so many Subjects for Rest Assured a few leading Characters Excepted you are the favourites and it would go hard to raise an Army against you—the above you may fully rely on—on proper means being first put in practice but in must be confided but to few. I am confident that not above three can keep A Secret and Sir John your Consul must not be One, *the Means* are Money and fair Promises such as you intend to perform and keep after the work is done.

N. B. When you honor me with an Answer put 2000 Pounds for 2000 Men. Farms, Florida, the Rest I undoubtedly shall fully comprehend.² One British Officer with me will be Sufficient to carry any such Scheme into Execution.

VII. GEORGE BECKWITH TO W. W. GRENVILLE.³

NEW YORK August 5th 1790

Sir

In conformity to Lord Dorchester's secret instructions dated the 27th June I esteem it my duty to transmit the several inclosures hereto annexed.

1. No 1 contains communications made to me by the gentleman high in office,⁴ with whom I am in the regular habit of intercourse, on which subjects nothing new has occurred.

¹ Sir George Yonge wrote to Mr. Aust, Feb, 16, 1791, relative to this secret agent, P. Allaire (R. D.), asking Mr. Aust to consult Mr. Pitt on the subject, "more especially as Mr. Pitt lately expressed himself satisfied with the Correspondence, and directed encouragement to be given for information relative to what He calls *Southern Farms* the meaning which is understood and He wishes for positive Instructions whether to put a final End to any Correspondence on the subject or not." See the next letter: "Southern Farms" means the Floridas.

² By this he means that "pounds" shall signify "men", and "farms", "Florida."

³ F. O. America L. Grenville was then Secretary of the State for the Home Department.

⁴ Alexander Hamilton?

2 No 2 is the general estimate of the annual disbursements of the government in consequence of the recent assumption of the State debts, and which as it respects the Ways and Means will be debated at the House of . . . Representatives tomorrow.

3 No 3 is a letter addressed to M^r Nepean which has been put into my hands by a person of the name of Dalton,¹ who declares himself to be a Lieutenant on the half pay list, in His Majesty's provincial service, this gentleman from his own account was sent last summer by the Creek Indians to London on the concerns of their nation and of other neighbouring tribes, and in consequence (as he asserts) had access to the King's Ministers in the present critical situation of affairs I thought it prudent to receive this letter, and to use general expressions of friendship towards these Indians, who border on the Spanish Provinces, avowing at the same time that I had no authority to treat with them (which they solicited by Mr. Dalton's accounts) and declaring that we were at peace with the United States.

Colonel Macgillivray who is the principal leader of the . . . Creeks is still here negotiating,² and nothing has yet transpired, I acknowledge I entertain some doubts whether this gentleman and M^r Dalton are perfectly cordial, but hitherto I have not been able to ascertain it.

The Spanish Resident presented a letter from Spain to The President on the 3rd Instant which came from Falmouth by the June packet.

I have the honor to be with the highest respect

Sir,

Your most obedient and most humble Servant

GEO. BECKWITH.

No. 1 "Extract"

NEW YORK July 15th 1790

I have communicated to the President the subjects on which we have conversed, and feel warranted to assure you that there is the most sincere good disposition on the part of the Government here to go into the consideration of all matters unsettled between Great Britain and us, in order to effect a perfect understanding between the two Countries, and to lay the foundation for future amity, this—particularly, as it respects commercial objects we view as conducive to our interests.

In the present stage of this business, it is difficult to say much on the subject of a treaty of Alliance, your rupture with Spain (if it shall take place) opens a very wide political field; thus much I can say, we are perfectly unconnected with Spain, have even some points unadjusted with that Court, and are prepared to go into the consideration of the question. The speeches or declarations of any persons whatever in the Indian Country or to the Westward suggesting hostile ideas respecting

¹ On Dalton's relations to McGillivray, see *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, pp. 153, 155, giving the latter's opinion of Bowles and Dalton. Evan Nepean was Under Secretary of State for the Home Department until 1789 or 1790.

² See *Report on Canadian Archives* as above, and *American State Papers, Ind. Aff.*, I. Tickett's *Alabama* gives an account of McGillivray based on documents in part.

the Forts, are not authorised by this Government Lord Dorchester's conduct with respect to the Indians is held by us to be a strong proof of his Lordship's dispositions to promote harmony and friendship.

VIII. THOMAS DALTON TO EVAN NEPEAN.¹

NEW YORK 3rd August 1790

Sir

I am sorry to inform you the answer of his Majesty's Minister on the 24th of June '89 is by no means acceptable to my friends in the Creek Nation. It gives them reason to suggest that they are totally *deserted* by your *standard*. However, Sir, I as a British Subject beg you may reconsider the last business. I communicated to you on the part of the Creeks Fearing the consequence that may hereafter follow I have communicated my sentiments to Major Beckwith Aid de Camp to Lord Dorchester, who does me the honour to transmit this letter to you, and leave him to explain my wish that you, write me, to Lord Dorchester, as through any other channel I cannot receive it with safety to myself and the interest of your Nation. As my Situation is delicate I submit to the information of my friends on the business and beg leave to Solicit the Honour of your answer by the first Packet

I have the Honour to be, Sir, Your Most Ob^t Hum^l Serv^t

THOS. DALTON

IX. GEORGE MILLER TO THE DUKE OF LEEDS.²

CHARLESTON September 3d. 1790

My Lord Duke

I have this day had the honour to receive your Grace's dispatch dated the 7th of May via New York, covering His Majesty's most gracious Message to both Houses of Parliament, communicating intelligence of the capture of some British Vessels by the Spaniards on the North Western Coasts of America and the very Affectionate and loyal Addresses to His Majesty in answer thereto

The possibility that hostilities might soon commence between Great Britain and Spain, having some weeks ago reached this place through the public papers, it instantly became my duty to make every enquiry in my power with respect to such parts of the Dominions of Spain as are at no great distance from hence.

The intelligence I have hitherto received is entirely confined to East Florida where a new Governour had lately arrived from Havannah in the room of Don Manuel De Lespedes; that the Garrison was augmented only in a small degree and that though the rumour of a war had reached that place, nothing had been done to put the fortifications in a state of defense. By an account I have more recently received, but on which I

¹ No. 3 in Beckwith's letter above.

² F. O. America H, No. 26. The Duke of Leeds was Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. George Miller was the English consul at Charleston.

cannot rely with the same confidence as on the other, it is said the new Governour had called in the outposts from the River St John, in order to secure the Citadel at St Augustine from any slight attack. The small number of Military at present in the Province precluding all hopes of resisting one of a more serious nature.

Situated as I am, and liable to imposition from the peculiar interests of men from whom I must derive what information I get, I am fully aware how cautious I ought to be in every intelligence I ought to convey to your Grace. I must therefore beseech that what I now send may be received as the most authentic I could at this time obtain, the more especially if in the event of a war any stroke should be meditated against the Province of East Florida.

But whatever the defenceless state of that Province may be, I must entreat your Grace to pardon the presumption of expressing my hopes that if a rupture has taken place between the Courts of London and Madrid, East Florida may not be considered of sufficient consequence to be attacked.

The fidelity I owe to my Sovereign and my zeal for the Glory of His Crown and the interests of His People call upon me to assign my reasons for these hopes.

The Provinces of East and West Florida in the possession of Spain are looked on with a very jealous eye by the people of these States the first holding out strong allurements to the Slaves in Georgia and Carolina even, to quit their masters and on their reaching St Augustine they meet with an asylum under the specious pretext of regard for their Souls. The free navigation of the river Mississippi guaranteed by the Treaty of Peace to the Citizens of America, has been in some instances obstructed, which has been ground of great uneasiness to them, and unless the present rupture with Spain produces an alteration in her Councils, will, in my opinion be entirely stopped by that Court, if ever attempted to be carried into effect by the Americans. The differences of advantages attending these two Provinces is immense. The former almost without inhabitants, except at two or three small posts; without soil to raise more than the bare necessities of life even were it more fully settled and without having national support to make exertions must render it a poor acquisition to any power. The latter, rich in soil, already tolerably populous on the banks of its various rivers and capable of becoming infinitely more so, might make it an object of greater importance. However, on this I do not presume to give an opinion.

The inference I would humbly beg leave to draw from this account of these two Provinces, the possession of which I do not believe would be to the permanent interest of Great Britain, is that the people of America do not, I have reason to think consider themselves under any obligation to Spain for the part she took in the late War but that it was entirely dictated by the contracts subsisting between her and France, therefore as it is possible the present convulsions there may dissolve the compact of the House of Bourbon and the Government of France may

adopt a different scheme of policy, the United States, this cause of contention remaining in the hands of Spain may in all probability find it their best interest to seize some favourable moment to second the views of Great Britain against a neighbour who has rendered herself very obnoxious to them. How far such a Junction might be good policy it is not for me to determine.

I must again solicit your Grace's pardon for what I have here offered for consideration. The principle upon which I have done it will, I trust excuse me however, its policy may be condemned. The manner in which these hints have been made requires every apology on my part, but a ship being on the point of sailing when your Grace's dispatch reached me I had not time to reduce them to better form.

Any information I may, from the most diligent attention to the subject, be enabled to communicate shall be forwarded to your Grace by every conveyance that offers

I have had the honour to reply on the 17th of July to Mr. Aust's letter of the 5th of May, duplicate of which I also received this day

With the utmost Deference and Respect, I have the honour to be

My Lord Duke

Your Grace's most humble and most obedient Servant,
GEO. MILLER.

X. OCCURRENCES FROM 6TH OCTOBER TO 4 NOVEMBER, 1790¹

The President of the United States has made Treaties with all the Indian Tribes both to the Northward and Southward and yet they daily commit murders, and in so open a manner that the People of Kentucky and the Western Territory have just now made an Invasion into the Northern Indian Country with two thousand Volunteers who are determined not to give or take quarters, this is only a small Speciment of the Obedience of those People to the United States, and their determined manner of Acting in every Respect the most conclusive to their Interest. We are pushing the Nootka Sound Trade all in our Power two from Boston three from Philadelphia and two from this port have sailed this fall for that port as you have in some manner almost entirely annihilated our trade to the West Indies we must push it some where. had we a Capital you would find us strongly opposing you in the China Trade, for every Dollar that can be got, goes there for Teas, Nankeens China and our Teas now sell 20 pC Cheaper than your best India Sales and I make no doubt in a few years we shall send Teas to Ireland for their Linnens, as for our Manufactories, they are in their Infancy and not Capable of furnishing one thousand part of our consumption. I went on purpose to Hartford (Connecticut) and into Boston State to examine into the Wollen and Sail Cloth Manufactory, it is a very humble beginning (the Wollen) their Capital about one thousand Sterling and the proprietors informed me, If Connecticut State did not Assist them with the lend of

¹ Chatham MSS. Bdle 343. Evidently sent to Pitt.

Two or Three Thousand pounds that they must give it up, as Individuals would not advance, the Sail Cloth Manufactory is not in a much better Situation, the only Manufactory that can hurt You at present is Nails and Leather Nor can we (in my opinion) oppose you in any other branch for many years such as Woollen and Linnens of all Sorts, Cutlery etc., therefore any other information is Erronious.

The Commissioners Appointed by the States of New York and Vermont have fixed and determined the boundaries of Vermont on certain Conditions the chief are, that Vermont pay thirty Eight thousand Dollars to New York within the Year 1792 and that they come into the Confederation before the year 1794.

I have done myself the honor of fully Answering your *two Letters* and I am fully confirmed in my Assertions and Opinions by what I have since lerned and my own knowledge and Experience of that Country believe me it will turn out to you a Second India, nay more, for you will always command the Granary of America, you will please to think Seriously of this matter, and should there be a War by all means possess the Floridas, they are more Valuable than the mines of Peru & Mexico should that Affair take place, you will please to think of me as Collector of the Customs, or Secretary of the Colony. I am so fully convinced of its Consequence that I would Emigrate on the above Conditions, Canada can never be a Commercial Province as they only have five Months Navigation in the Year and that a very dangerous one Whereas the Mississippi is always Navigable and the Western People can at all times Raft down their Lumber and produce and their demands in a few years will be Equal to one half of the United States for British Goods, this is as clear as any Problem in Euclid, it is no vain Speculation no Idea of acquiring Approbation unmerited, but what must be Absolutely the Case, let who will possess the Floridas. . . .¹

Should your Government Ever possess the Floridas the Emigration from this Country would exceed beliefe as there are many discontents amongst us, and New Orleans would in Seven Years be the largest City in America and the greatest Mart for Grain and Lumber.

I Remain with profound Respect. Sir

Your very Hum. Serv,

November 4th 1790

R. D.

XI. OCCURRENCES FROM 1ST DECEMBER, 1790, to 6TH JANUARY 1791.²

I had the honor in my last letter of —th December to state my meaning fully, also to have answered your favor of 7 October, which I hope you have received.

I Request your house would consult some professional Man, with respect to the facility of coming and going from New Orleans, both to your Windward and Leeward Islands, they can go at all times, and their passages are equal nearly, that is about fourteen days, it is the Center to

¹ A digression on business matters follows.

² F. O. America, J.

all the West Indies and the only port on the Continent that is so equally situated the Utility and benefit that now Exists. I have had the honor to explain with respect to its future benefit you are more Competent to judge than I am, but the Imports and Exports from New Orleans in Seven Years, were you possessed of it would (in my opinion) exceed any state in the Union by the Rapid Increase of the Western Territory and Emigration to Florida.

With Respect to Aid I am fully convinced they would give it to you on the conditions already mentioned, at least from every information and knowledge I have and can get, but you will please to observe, I do not hold myself accountable for the Absolute performance, they are *Swiss* and must be used accordingly, it is not out of love or friendship they Assist but Necessity (for want of Cash) compels them and your greatest Enemies were they to offer more and better terms would procure them, Circumstance worthy your most serious Condition, but by all means let me conjure you not to trust to many, Secrets of this importance should be instructed to but few. I also would prefer a Military Man to be sent in whom they may have more confidence than in me I will Assist him all in my power but let him be a very prudent One or he will be *too tall by a head* as those Western Lads have very Summary Laws.

Should you not coincide with my opinion S——[pai]n will hold your Islands at pleasure having the Havanah and Florida where their Navy lays Secure from the haricanes and where all your leeward fleets must past and where they have every Necessary for forming a Navy. Naval Stores from Carolina and Hemp from the Ohio, they now carry produce to New Orleans upwards of Two thousand three hundred Miles of¹ this Country is not superiour to Mexico to you, I am a very Ignorant man, the Immense quantities of clothing that this Country must want in a few years would be of the Utmost Importance to your Revenue.

The Windward Islands can go and come by the Windward passage the Leward Islands by the Gulf none will ex[tend] (in general) above fourteen days your house will be surprised that they never saw its Consequences but once point out will be sufficient

Twenty years possession of this Country you would want nothing from Rushia, your own Colonies would not only supply you with Iron, Hemp and Naval Stores, but you would supply other Kingdoms with those Articles and Grain you would possess the Granary and Arsenal of America and hold all the West Indies, French, Dutch, Spanish and Danes at your disposal by having an Immediate access to them at all times and in so short a space of time they may be conquered and reconquered before any Acco^l. can be sent to Europe and Succours sent them.

It would be prudent in my opinion to try what Aid could be acquired before a Person is sent, I know no other method than that which I have already stated by Employing a few leading and popular Men amongst them, as for Strangers going and proposing the Question, he would never succeed and ten to one would but lose his life they must

¹ If.

first pave the way and get adherents, when ready formed, a Person from your House as *director in the Manufactory* would be absolutely Necessary. I think I have fully Explained every particular and as you can do nothing before May if your house think proper to make the Experiment your Answer to mine of the 1 December and this will be time enough to put things in a proper train and the end of the journey to Kentuck. I refer you for the particulars of the plan as the most prudent, frugal, and Elligible. [R. D.]

XII. EXTRACT "R. D." TO SIR G. YONGE 20TH JANUARY, 1791.¹

Your favor of the 30 November came to hand the 17th Inst. and have duly considered the same. I should have obeyed your orders of the 4th of said Month with punctuallity in regard to your Southern Farms and am convinced I could have assisted you in selling them having had the promise of Two very Substantial and *Capital Farmers*.

You will be pleased to inform me by first opportunity wether the Agency for this Country is Also discontinued as well as that for Canada and wether I am not to be allowed my former Sum of £200 per [?] Annum to keep Affairs in such a Situation, that should you want to settle your *Southern Farms*, it may be done with lapidition² on the Terms I had the honor of writing you the 6th December and 5 January last as well as to inform you the Real State of your Creditors here

XIII. WM. A. BOWLES TO LORD GRENVILLE.³

My Lord

I have the honor of enclosing to your Lordship A paper, which is addressed to his Majesty, and which I trust I shall be permitted to deliver to him in person, if there is no objection to any part of its contents or to such a manner of delivery.

On both these points I submit myself to the Judgment of his Majesty's Ministers and More especially of your Lordship.

This paper contains enough to express the wishes of the Nation, under the present circumstances; But the connection which it is wished to form with Great Britain, goes to objects of a more extensive nature and such, as would not be proper to be opened in the address to his Majesty.

These, I have reserved for a private letter, which I will take the liberty of writing to your Lordship and your Lordship will Judge whether they are such as will deserve the Attention of Great Britain, or not.

I have the honor to be,

My Lord

Your Lordships Most Obedient Servant

Osburns Hotel

WM. A. BOWLES.

Jany. 3d. 1791

¹ F. O. America I. See above page 718, 719.

² Expedition (?)

³ F. O. America L.

The Representation of Wm. Augustus Bowles in behalf of himself
and

Unatoy
Kuahtekiske
Sepouejah
Tuskeniah
Wopio

Deputed from the United Nation of Creeks and Cherokees

To His Britannic Majesty

May it Please your Majesty

In conjunction with the persons whose names are above mentioned, I have the honour to address your Majesty, as Representatives from the United Nation of Creeks and Cherokees: Who, united to your Majesty by the obligation of former Treaties but much more by the ties of attachment to the British Name, and Character, which no change of circumstances has been able to obliterate from their Minds, have commissioned us to seek the presence of your Majesty, through the dangers and hazards of a long journey by land and by water, And, to explain in the fullest manner, their present situation, their old alliance with the British Nation, what they have borne, and what they have forborne, to preserve inviolate their faith and attachment etc etc etc

Having discharged my duty towards the United Nation by conveying their Humble Address and representation to your Majesty; It may be expected that I should say somewhat of myself, who, being one of your Majesty's subjects and upon the list of your half pay officers, ought to give some reason for appearing before your Majesty in my present character.

Not to detain your Majesty with much upon a subject so insignificant as myself. It is enough perhaps to say, that I was an Ensign in one of your Majesty's Provincial Corps at New York in the year 1778 and went with the Corps to West Florida where they arrived in the beginning of the year 1779, that I was struck by the Commanding Officer from the list of your Majesty's Officers without the benefit of a Court Martial, the form of a resignation or any one reason assigned. Thus reduced, by a stretch of power, never paralleled in your Majesty's Service, in a strange country, without any means of support only about fourteen years of age, I owed my preservation to the generosity of a Chief of the Creek Nation, who succored me in his family. I took the Indian Dress, soon habituated myself to their Manners, and became at length, from custom, and from choice attached to the Nation to which I was otherwise bound by the ties of gratitude.

When your Majesty's Commander in West Florida, Genl Campbell in the year 1781 sent to the Creek Country for Warriors to join the British troops, to act against the Spaniards, I came among those, that were sent, and served as an Indian, during the whole time the British troops continued in that Country, when the place was about being surrendered to Spain, it was proposed to me by Genl Campbell that I should join the corps to which I had once belonged, and I accordingly accepted

a Commission, which I held till September 1783; when, finding your Majesty had no immediate call for my service and previous to the evacuation of New York I obtained leave of absence from Lord Dorchester, and, led by the attachment which was still warm in my breast I returned to the country of the Creeks, with whom I have lived ever since.

What relates to myself while I served with your Majesty's officers, is neither becoming, nor necessary for me to relate; As to that part of my life which has been spent among the people, who are so little known in this Country, I may venture to say this much for myself; that I hope a British subject is discharging the character, we all aim at, if he is endeavouring to do good in any part of the Globe, that among the people, where I am settled, I have always made this my endeavour, and not to speak proudly, I believe I have done much to promote their happiness, both in their private life and in their National concerns. But of this I am sure, and in speaking of it I shall not fear to speak proudly, That I have always preserved my Allegiance to your Majesty and my affection to this Country, that I have risked my life and wasted my property to maintain both; and that in all circumstances I will endeavour to advance the interest of G. Britain.

Waiving all other proofs which I could produce, if necessary of these declarations, I trust them upon the credit of what is now in your Majesty's presence. Your Majesty sees one of your subjects becoming the adviser and the leader of an independent and populous Nation, presenting to your Majesty their devotion and services as Allies, both in peace and War; and under circumstances highly advantageous to the Commerce and Interest of Great Britain. It rarely happens to a subject to produce such evidence of his attachment to the Interest of his Country.

That your Majesty may in all parts of your dominions have subjects, who, with less opportunity, may have the same sincerity and zeal to serve their Country as I have, is the fervent prayer, of your Majesty's

Most true and faithful Subject and Servant

WM. A. BOWLES.

XIV. WM. A. BOWLES TO LORD GRENVILLE.¹

My Lord

I now trouble your Lordship with those points which I mentioned in my letter, as not necessary to be stated in the Address to his Majesty but which are eventually highly deserving, in my judgment the consideration of his Majesty's Ministers. When I go the length of opening my designs to your Lordship, it is not so much upon the confidence, merely of that secrecy which belongs to every person in your Lordship's Station, as from the particular opinion, I have been taught to entertain of Your Lordship's character, and which assures me, I am safe in communicating what other wise should not be known till executed.

Your Lordship knows, that I have applied to the Court of Spain for their acquiescing in our having two ports on the coast of Florida. By the

¹ F. O. America, I.

silence hitherto held on that subject, I believe, the Spanish Government do not mean to accede to my demand. If that is not acceded to, by the time I arrive in Florida, I shall immediately attack the Spanish Forts which are few and weak, and I calculate that in the space of two Months at furthest I shall have driven the Spaniards from the whole country of the Florida's And that of New Orleans And that the lower part of Louisiana and both the Floridas will belong completely to the Creek and Cherrokee Nation.

As this will no doubt bring upon us a descent from the Havannah, I shall immediately upon the Spaniards evacuating, March a strong force across the Mississippi towards Mexico, not only with a view of carrying the war from home, but to avail Myself of the state I know mens minds are in, all over the country

It is not long since I marched seven hundred miles in that country, for the purpose partly of exercising troops, that I had been training in a New Method, and partly to try what influence such a movement might have. This expedition answered both my views. The numberless addresses, I received in writing from all parts, satisfied me that I might have proceeded to the centre of Mexico and had been received as a deliverer. But the affairs of our Nation were not then ripe, according to my judgment for the experiment.

Relying upon these facts, I should as soon as the Floridas, and the lower part of Louisiana were mastered, immediately march at the head of a strong force towards Mexico. If during the progress of this force, I found it likely I should succeed in that country so well as I am led to believe I should, I would proceed without delay to Mexico, and in conjunction with the Natives declare it independent of the Spaniards. In such event I should have no fears about the state of things in the Floridas.

But should it appear to me not so adviseable to proceed to the capital of Mexico, I judge that the alarm created by My force hovering on the borders of it would be such, as to enable me to make my terms for the Floridas; and that in such event, the Spaniards would be content to yield the Floridas to the Creeks and Cherrokees.

I will not mispend your Lordship's time in reasoning upon a subject that is already sufficiently understood. The advantages of a free trade with the Spanish Colonies are well understood in this Country—But I will venture to say the means of attaining it are not so easily seen—I believe, if Britain attains it, she will attain it in some such mode as I now mention and then she will save herself the repediton of such Tragedies as were acted at Porto Bello and Carthagená, And which will ever end, as those attempts did. It was the opinion of Lord Clive, that by the Troops of the Country, only, India was to be conquered and retained. Experience has shewn he was right; and it may be worth consideration, if the Maxim is not as good in America as in Indostin.

I should inform your Lordship that these Speculations would meet with other support than the force of the Creek and Cherrokee Nation. There are now settled in the Cumberland Country, as set of men, who

are the Relicts of the American Army ; These people are weary of their Situation and their inactive life, and are ready for any thing that will put them in Motion.

I have had a request from these people to prevail on the Council to admit them into our Country And to lead them on an expedition to the Spanish settlements, that being the object of adventure now most thought of, in that part of the world. From these people I think I could receive, at least six thousand effective men.

These people are desirous on any terms, of coming to settle amongst us, as well for the objects of peace as those of War. For, at present, they are shut out from the sea. They feel no attachment to the Americans and would be glad to abandon everything for a situation near the Sea in our Country.

In discovering these designs to your Lordship, I mean merely to lay before his Majesty's Ministers the situation, the designs, and wishes, of the Nation, in all openness and sincerity.

To return to the principal point which is the subject of the address to His Majesty and which is one great object of our Embassy—The admission to the free Ports—I do trust this is so reasonable on our part and so advantageous to Great Britain, that it will be conceded in some mode or other. Either by an Act of Parliament, if necessary, or by a direction to the Governor and the Collector of the Customs at Nassau in New Providence and elsewhere, if the interpretation of the statute can be made in our favour, Or in some Mode that may seem best to the Kings Ministers.

If we are successful in this point—The Creek and Cherrokee Nation can work their way in spite of Spaniards and Americans, and May before many years are past, confer on Great Britan in return a line of free trade which she never before enjoyed, nor could attain, in my humble opinion, but by their interposition.

As I am opening my mind with great plainness I will endeavour to make his Majesty's Ministers easy upon another point—It may be there is some awkwardness with regard to the Spanish Court, in our being received here ; Political reasons, or etiquette, be it what it may.

In a few words I came here to serve the Creek and Cherrokee Nation and to serve G. Britain—To attain this end I am content to waive everything, that does not necessarily produce that end—The substance not the circumstance is my aim—If a whisper across the Atlantic can procure our Vessels admission to the free Ports, our purpose, thus far will be as completely answered, as if it was effected by an Act of Parliament, And of the business of the Treaty could be transacted without my presenting the Medal to his Majesty and receiving another from him, I should think myself warranted in disobeying the orders of the Council. Should this mode of transacting it be more agreeable to his Majesty's Ministers—Rather [than] raise the jealousies and suspicions of the Spanish Court I would waive in behalf of the Chiefs and myself any open marks of distinction—I am ready to yield all such points, If I can depart from hence,

with a firm assurance that a good understanding is established with G. Britain, that the treaty now renewed is not the less sincere for being secret, that a correspondence will be kept up, and that our vessels will always be admitted into the free ports of the West Indies, or at least into that part of Nassau.

What I have hitherto urged to your Lordship, has been upon topics purely Commercial and such as appear to me to interest Great Britain, as well as the Nation of Creeks and Cherrokees. There are other considerations with regard to the interest of G. Britain alone.

The late peace with the Americans by putting an end to hostilities cannot, I should think have removed all cause of suspicion and jealousy between the two Countries. That it has not on the side of the Americans your Lordship will collect from the following facts.

In the Month of April 1788 a proposal was secretly made to me from the Americans, to join with them to bring about a Treaty of Alliance offensive and defensive, and to lead the Indians on an attack upon the Northern tribes, and the British Posts. This was refused, but a communication like this not being safe, as they thought, in the breast of a person so hostile, as I had on that occasion declared myself, some method was to be devised to get rid of me; And in the months of August and September following, several attempts were made to cut me off.

I mention this fact of their proposal to me, only amongst many others, that might be produced, to shew, the Americans are now waiting their opportunity to seize the remainder of the British Colonies, and that the first occasion will not be suffered to pass.

I do, therefore in behalf of Great Britain press most seriously upon your Lordship this consideration, Whether with such active enemies in the neighbourhood of the British Colonies, it is not, I will not say wise, But absolutely necessary, for Great Britain to have some Alliance and connection to back her interest in those parts? And who, but the Nation of Creeks and Cherrokees present themselves, as proper for that Alliance? Great Britain can never find that support, she will want, among the Northern Indians, who are reduced in number, sunk in Spirit, and have little resource, but the poor cloathing, and other gratifications they receive from his Majesty's Governors.

And I may venture to say that such a general correspondence is now established between the Indians on the borders of Canada and the Creeks and Cherrokees that even the former, dependent as they may be supposed, will never again be brought to act, with full energy, unless the same cause is maintained by the advice and approbation of the Creeks and Cherrokees. And this general confederacy now formed and gaining daily strength among all the Indian Nations, is a new posture of affairs on that Continent which is not yet known here, but which must be considered in every future speculation formed with regard to Indian politics.

The situation of the Creeks in the two Floridas seems peculiarly to fit them for being useful allies to Great Britain. They are in the neighbourhood of the West India Islands. They have the Americans on one

side and the Spaniards on the other, both Enemies to the Interest of Great Britain, that at present, nominally in peace with her. Upon a quarrel with either power who can be so useful as the Creeks? If the British Colonies are to be defended, who are so able to make a diversion as the Creeks, offensive or defensive,—they seem to be pointed out, by inspection of the Maps merely, as the Nation that Great Britain should cultivate.

In pressing this on your Lordship I speak the language of an Indifferent Spectator, or rather one biassed towards this Country. It has been the misfortune of this Country to be less knowing in her transactions with America, than in the rest of her politics. I trust she will not suffer the last card she has left to be played as the great game was

But to save that she must purchase friends, and that soon, or she will have again to fight for her colonies without an allie to support her; I speak tenderly when I say without an Allie, for suppose the present address of the Creek Nation should not be thought worthy of notice, and being thus rejected they should be left to adjust their affairs in the best Manner their domestic Interest suggests, suppose they should deem it wise to unite with their old enemies the Americans;

I can tell your Lordship what will be the first object of such new formed Alliance. It will be an attack upon the British posts in which they will I believe be joined by all the Northern Nations, if they adhere to the Union now subsisting among the Indian Nations.

What will then happen to Canada, and to the other possessions of G. Britain, your Lordship may well conjecture.—Such events may take place before many months are passed, should the wish of the Nation be disappointed in their present address to his Majesty, and it will be utterly out of my power, with all the attention they have hitherto shewn to my advice, to influence their Counsels on this subject. Then may be led when either their inclinations or their Interests are to be gratified, but when both are opposed, they will take some course, where one or the other leads them.

It will be my misfortune to view the effects of the storm I can no longer govern and I shall at last behold that catastrophe which I have employed so much labor in various stations to prevent or retard.

It is painful to me and perhaps ungracious to entertain your Lordship with such disastrous speculations but I meant to deal honestly and openly with his Majesty's Government and I thought myself bound to conceal no danger that could be guarded against if known, one main and only guard is now offered, and I promise myself the good fortune of this Country will suggest the wisdom the seize it.

Should it be thought proper by His Majesty's Ministers to add the former object of treaty which is wholly Commercial, this also, which is political and leads to the business of War, I shall then be obliged to call upon Government for Assistance in providing Arms and Military Stores, those being Articles which must for the present be supplied from this Country these may easily be supplied without the Government appearing

to have any share in the transaction. They are articles of Commerce, which I can obtain from any Merchant in London to be shipped for the port of Nassau. From which place they can be easily conveyed into the Creek Nation.

After detaining your Lordship so long, I will add only one word more, which is that I do rely on your Lordship's particular judgment and character for our business meeting with a due, and deliberate consideration. I have the honor to be

My Lord, Your Lordship's

Most obedient and very humble Servant,

WM. A. BOWLES.¹

ADELPHI Jany. 13, 1791

The Right Honorable Lord Grenville.

XV. WM. A. BOWLES TO LORD GRENVILLE.²

My Lord

Having communicated to your Lordship the letter I had written to El Conde de Florida Blanca respecting the demand of free ports I think it proper to submit to your Lordship the enclosed letter which is the first overture I make towards reviving that subject.

Your Lordship will, I hope perfectly understand that I make this communication with no view of entangling the Kings Ministers in any transactions between the Creek Nation and the Spanish Court. But that his Majesty's Ministers may know what I am doing in a matter, where Great Britain may be remotely concerned.

If your Lordship does not think this troublesome I shall continue to transmit what follows from it, between me and the Spanish Ambassador.

Your Lordship will have the goodness to send me back the letter

I have the Honor to be

My Lord, Your Lordships

Most obedient and very humble Servant

ADELPHI

WM. A. BOWLES

Jany. 25, 1791

Right Honorable Lord Grenville

¹ In the *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, p. xlii, Mr. Brymner notes that in the State Papers (Q. 45-2 p. 535 and onwards) is a correspondence respecting the mission of Bowles and his party of Cherokees on their arrival at Quebec from the Bahamas. "The sum of Lord Dorchester's letter to Mr. Grenville respecting the deputation which His Lordship had tried in vain to dissuade from going to London is in the last paragraphs of the letter." Lord Dorchester says: "Their resentment against the States, arising from injudicious encroachments upon their territory, might be appeased by ensuring them a more liberal treatment under the King's protection." On March 7, 1791, Lord Grenville wrote to Lord Dorchester, reporting their arrival and stating the reception they met with in the following terms: "Such of their requests as related to views of hostility against the United States have met with no kind of encouragement, but they will in some degree be gratified in their wish of intercourse with the British Dominions by an admission to the free posts [ports] in His Majesty's West Indian Islands, supposing that they should find themselves in a situation to avail themselves of this indulgence."

² F. O. America I.

XVI. WM. A. BOWLES TO THE SPANISH AMBASSADOR AT LONDON.¹

ADELPHI Jany. 26th 1791

Sir

I had the honor of inclosing to your Excellency in a letter from New Providence in the Bahama Islands A letter addressed to El Conde de Florida Blanca upon some subjects that concern the Nation of Creek and Cherrokee Indians. I requested him to favour me with an answer thereto, through your Excellency, trusting that I should, on my arrival here meet with some answer.

The object of my coming to this Country is not likely to keep me a great length of time here. And it is very material not only to the Affairs of our Nation but to the interest of his Catholic Majesty in those parts that I should receive some answer to that letter before I leave this Country.

I now trouble your Excellency to know whether you have received from El Conde de Florida Blanca any thing which is intended to be communicated to me. And I shall be ready to receive it in writing whenever your Excellency pleases.

I shall also be ready to confer with your Excellency if you should think it necessary.

I have the honor to be yours

Most obedient Servant

WM. A. BOWLES

His Catholick Majesty's Ambassador at London

XVII. GEO. BECKWITH TO [LORD DORCHESTER?] ²

PHILADELPHIA 2nd December 1791

My Lord

I did not intend to write to your Lordship by the present Conveyance had not the following circumstance which respects a man with whose character you are well acquainted taken place upon the Georgia frontier.

The field officer commanding the few companies or regular troops dispersed along the Southern confines has within a few days past written to Government that the Commissioners employed in running the boundary with Georgia under the Creek treaty of 1790 have been interrupted in their progress and compelled to withdraw by the Lower Creeks at the instigation of a Mr. Bowles who styles himself a General and declares that he is agent or superintendent General to those tribes from Great Britain; the officer also informs that Mr. Bowles has been recently in England, that he touched at the Bahamas on his return to America and that he has brought very valuable presents to these Indians to the amount "as he states" of fifty thousand pounds sterling, that he has declared to those tribes his being authorized to promise them the reestablishment of their old boundary with Georgia which is more advantageous to them than that fixed by the treaty of New York in 1790, and, that he has

¹ Enclosed in above.

² F. O. America K.

solicited their having recourse to Arms to effect this, promising them an English reinforcement in the Spring, to which the Indians replied, that prior to their commencing hostilities they would wait the arrival of these succours. General Macgillivray who is usually in the Upper Creek Country has written to those tribes and warning them of their danger in listening to Bowles's insinuations and threatening if they do that he will abandon them to their fate. Such is the outline of the information on this subject which has been laid before the Senate and which of course I immediately communicated to the King's Minister.

I have some reason to think that Mr. Edward Rutledge of South Carolina is the person intended to be sent to London as Minister Plenipotentiary but I mention this as a matter of uncertainty. I have also the same grounds to believe that it is the wish of this Government to draw the Chiefs of the hostile Indians to Philadelphia as soon as they can open an Intercourse with them and to make treaty with them here. I have mentioned my ideas on these subjects to Mr. Hammond.¹

I have the honor to be with great respect

Your Lordships

Most obedient and very faithful Servant

GEO. BECKWITH.

¹ The English minister to the United States.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

La Evolucion de la Historia. Por VALENTIN LETELIER. (Santiago de Chile: Alberto Poblete Garin; Madrid: Victoriano Suarez. 1900. Two vols., pp. 354; 545.)

IN the year 1886, the Council of Public Instruction of Chile offered a gold medal for a prize for the best paper upon the subject "Why is History continually remade? Conditions which the modern Spirit exacts in historical work." The paper of the author of this work was regarded as the best of the ten papers presented and the prize was awarded to him. To this is due the idea of the present work, which is however greatly expanded from the original publication. In place of a pamphlet of sixty-seven pages, the present work is ten or twelve times as large, consisting of two volumes, divided into three books and eleven long chapters.

In order to trace a definite theory of the historic art, it is necessary to examine what are the causes of this continual remaking of history, and with this object in view the author first considers tradition, which in primitive societies must be regarded as history itself. Tradition, if it does not preserve a record of events with as much exactness as history, reflects popular ideas, beliefs, prejudices and feelings, and reproduces the impressions caused by events. The vitality and development of traditions are due to the fact that each generation gives them a meaning and scope in harmony with the popular sentiments and aspirations. Traditions which have preserved from prehistoric times the ideas, notions, and impressions which make up and form popular beliefs are classified as myths. These are distinguished by one common quality, divine intervention in human events. Myths should in turn be divided into allegoric myths and symbolic myths. The former simply describe phenomena with no attempt at explanation, while the symbolic myth always involves a more or less puerile and imaginary explanation of a truth. There is also another class of myths which really record events, although they reach us distorted and obscured by the intermixture of fable. These are historic myths, which after all are nothing more than spontaneous alteration which traditional history suffers in primitive peoples. The supernatural, which distinguishes all myths, and which appears incompatible with the historic origin attributed to a part of them, is the last phase of development suffered by traditions under the influence of popular imagination. As long as a tradition does not acquire a mythical character, its development is normal and it may be easily extinguished through lack of interest, but as soon as a tradition is converted into myth it develops freely without regard to the laws of nature. The vitality of the tradition

is strengthened by the religious sentiment which has taken it under its protection. In verifying the rules which are to be observed for the interpretation of myths, and for the appreciation of their historic value, the author examines the classes represented by Max Müller on the one hand and Andrew Lang upon the other and arrives at the conclusion that there is no real opposition between the two.

The author then turns his attention to the discussion of the legend, the word being used in the same sense of a written narrative of events that are supposed to have taken place in historic time and the record of which has been preserved by means of tradition. The peculiar quality of the legend, a quality which distinguishes it from annals and from history, is the written reproduction of oral reports without any discussion or investigation. Those legends are apocryphal which do not belong to the authors under whose name they are known; those are false which have been invented by the authors who have written them.

In examining, as he does very fully, the different classes of legend, it is significant that Professor Letelier, a professor in the leading university of a country of rigid catholicism, uses both the Old Testament and the New Testament. To the former he gives the name of "Biblical legends" and to the latter "Evangelical legends." He lays down as an absolute rule of historical investigation that no prejudice can be felt in favor of the sacred books of any particular religion, and he places on precisely the same plane the Koran, the Vedas and the Scriptures.

Having examined the origin and development of traditional history under the forms of myths and legends, the two forms which it successively adopts, the author now proceeds to the examination of annals or chronicles. These he describes as written narrations made according to chronological order by contemporary witnesses and entirely regardless of the social causes which produce the events reported. Annals, however, mark two distinct advances in the evolution of history; the introduction of chronology by the establishment of a particular era and the introduction of the study of geography resulting from the necessity of fixing definitely the places in which the events occurred. The chronicler always disregards social phenomena. And from this there result two vicious tendencies; the first is to disregard the social causes of historical events and to look only at the personal agency, or in other words, to concentrate in the hands of a few prominent men the actions produced by society as a whole, and the second is to pass over those events in which historical personages have taken no direct part. The chronicle is an incomplete history which makes no explanation of events when they are produced independently of notable persons and which never arrives at general conclusions.

Traditions, myths, legends and annals thus represent different stages in the evolution of history, and after an elaborate examination of the historical value of each, the author concludes that none of them has a right to the credit which was originally given them. The historian of the present day is completely justified in his efforts to secure better evidence for correcting and compiling our knowledge of the past.

The author then divides into two classes, called respectively real evidence and virtual evidence, the sources to which the modern historian turns as a result of the evolution of history. Real testimony consists of historical documents made up of inscriptions, coins, of ancient handwriting and of hieroglyphics. Under virtual testimony he discusses archaeology, ethnography, folk-lore, literature, which is not intended to be historical, and language.

Having therefore completed in the first and second books of his work an examination of all the sources of history and of the advantages and defects of each, the author begins by considering in the third book whether it is really possible to establish history as a science, and arrives at the conclusion that the result of the evolution which he has attempted to describe is that history may be regarded as a science, that there are not lacking methods of inquiry to arrive at the exact knowledge of many events and of many generations of the life of civilized nations. There is no rule which requires investigators to give absolute credit to any contemporary witnesses, nor which authorizes them to study historic facts with any less attention than should be given to investigation of physical phenomena. The historian has realized that to complete the knowledge of the past it is indispensable to embrace within the elements of its jurisdiction the study of social elements, and this has resulted in the incorporation into history of all those facts which serve to determine the study of the arts, of industry, of science, of religion, and of customs in past generations. And here history touches upon the confines of sociology. They meet upon the same ground but should never be confounded. Just as astronomic, physical, and biological events which are registered in history are no different from those examined by astronomy, physics, and biology, thus the same social facts are at the same time the object of historical and sociological investigations. There is one point of difference between them. History relates them as events, or, at the most, defines the social conditions in which they are produced, while sociology examines them as general phenomena. In relating such social facts, history need no more conflict with sociology than it does conflict with astronomy by reporting eclipses. When such facts are of specific character they may be regarded simply as events; when of a generic character they may be properly called social phenomena. Sociology studies industry, science, institutions, beliefs and all the social elements by excluding, absolutely, the intervention of man, and by regarding them as matters subject to the organic law of development. History is a concrete science, a science of particular facts, while sociology, on the contrary, is a general science, a science which by means of induction converts specific into general facts. With this comparison of history and sociology, a comparison made with great detail, the author closes the work of which the barest outline can be given here.

EDWARD H. STROBEL.

Studies in History and Jurisprudence. By JAMES BRYCE, D.C.L.
(New York : Oxford University Press, American Branch. 1901.
Pp. 926.)

WHILE yet a student at Oxford, Mr. Bryce became an authority on certain phases of European history. *The Holy Roman Empire* was published in 1864. From 1870 to 1892 the author held the Regius Professorship of Civil Law at Oxford. He was a member of Gladstone's Cabinet of 1892, and has always been a careful student of law and history and political institutions.

This latest publication of Mr. Bryce comprises eighteen essays and lectures. Though written at different times, they have nearly all been revised or rewritten for publication. Only two of them have been previously published. Many were first given as lectures to Oxford students. A wide range of topics is here treated. The English and the Roman empires are compared. English law and Roman law are compared from the standpoint of their effects upon the present evolution of history throughout the world, and from the standpoint of their origin, nature and development. Several chapters are devoted to the study of constitutions, Roman, English, American, South African and Australian. In one chapter we are introduced to the unique institutions of Iceland. In another, entitled "Obedience," we are treated to some fresh observations on the philosophic basis of the state. That on "The Nature of Sovereignty" is an illuminating discussion of an old topic.

The work abounds in broad generalizations based upon a wide range of political observations. Our author shows us that we are not so very far removed from the old Greco-Roman world. There are peculiar phenomena manifest at the beginning of the twentieth century which bring us very near to that ancient life. Alexander carried something of Grecian influence far into Asia. Later the Romans undertook the Herculean task of unifying and Romanizing the whole of Alexander's empire, as well as the rest of northern Africa and southern Europe. Later still, the Christian Church appeared aiming at universal dominion and tending still farther to draw the nations together. The distinct aim was universal dominion with one religion and one system of justice. When Rome fell, Grecian art and philosophy, Roman law and the Christian religion still survived to become in our own day agencies for the unifying of all the races of all lands. "Europe—that is to say the five or six races which we call the European branch of mankind—has annexed the rest of the earth, extinguishing some races, absorbing others, ruling others as subjects and spreading over their native customs and beliefs a layer of European ideas which will sink deeper and deeper till the old native life dies out." In a measurable time, the author concludes, European science, forms of thought and ways of life will prevail in every land with the possible exception of China; and even China is not likely to resist for many generations, at least not for many centuries. It is to throw light upon this great modern phenomenon of the European-

izing of mankind that Mr. Bryce compares the English occupation of India with the unifying policies of the Roman Empire. Chiefly through law and its notions of government has Rome influenced civilization. In this way Rome has influenced England and has hence a share in the Europeanizing of India. Much of Russian law is Roman in its origin, and through Russia Rome is assimilating other Asiatic peoples.

But England has also developed a distinct and independent system of law, and now the two systems of law, English and Roman, are competing for the leading place in the unification of mankind. At present Roman, or civil law, prevails over wider areas and has more numerous subjects, but English law is being diffused more rapidly over the globe. Mr. Bryce discusses the question of the probable triumph of one or the other of these two legal systems, but he himself inclines to the opinion that elements of each will survive in a unified system of law for the world.

English law differs radically from Roman law in the emphasis given to the rights of the individual. Roman law originated at a time when there was no general and distinct realization of individual rights and privileges. The individual was lost in the mass. By a peculiar concurrence of peoples and events in England the various classes early began to associate definite conscious rights and privileges under the name of law. Common law was but a formulation of customs to which the people were attached. Laws set by Councils or Parliaments were the formulation of rules granting or restoring to the people their cherished rights or privileges, or they were viewed as acts of tyranny to be resented and overthrown. Lawmaking was recognized as a distinct business of infinite importance to the people.

In Rome, on the other hand, law grew up, for the most part, as incident to the magisterial and administrative functions of government. The Roman assembly, with whom according to modern theory sovereign power rested, invested the Emperors with various magisterial offices of government; yet neither the Emperor nor any other officer was endowed with a distinct function of lawmaking. The law grew out of the practice of administering justice. The codes issued by Emperors represent the accomplished facts of administrative and magisterial conduct. In theory both Roman and English law are derived from the people. "St. Thomas Aquinas," says Mr. Bryce, "recognized sovereignty as vested in the people hardly less explicitly than does the Declaration of Independence." But there is a world-wide difference between the meaning to be attached to the words of St. Thomas in the thirteenth century and the language of the Declaration in the eighteenth. In the one case "the people" means a self-conscious body politic with power to deliberate and choose, and initiate and control. In the other case "the people" stood for a traditional method of accounting for a logical difficulty. St. Thomas was ready to surmount this obstacle by saying that "the people" were the source of law and authority or by saying that God was the source of law and authority. In either case the form of words was a mere device

for solving a logical difficulty. But the makers of the Declaration of Independence were stating a fact and not merely dealing in logic.

The volume fitly closes with Mr. Bryce's Inaugural Address as Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford in 1870 and his Valedictory upon the resignation of the office in 1893. In his inaugural, Mr. Bryce prophesies various practical advantages from the study of civil law which in his valedictory he frankly confesses have not been fulfilled. But any one who reads these essays will perceive that the study has other uses which the ardent youth of thirty years of age had not fully realized. With all his knowledge of law Mr. Bryce has remained an historian. And more than any other writer of our day he has shown how law may be used to illuminate history.

JESSE MACY.

Imperium et Libertas. A Study in History and Politics. By BERNARD HOLLAND. (London: Edward Arnold. 1901. Pp. 379.)

A FEELING has been gaining ground in England of late years that the future of the country as one of the great powers of the world depends upon maintaining the empire across the sea, and especially that part of it which consists of self-governing colonies. In sharp contrast with opinions current fifty years ago, Englishmen to-day believe not only that the connection with those colonies will be permanent, but that it ought to become closer and stronger as time goes on. They feel that the problem of consolidating the empire is one which must be seriously considered in the immediate future; and this, with the conviction that the American Revolution was a misfortune due to a mistaken policy, has produced much study of the course of British colonization in the past. Mr. Holland's book, which has resulted from such a train of thought, contains a survey of some important phases in the history of the British possessions, together with an examination of the present and future relations to the mother country of the self governing colonies. The work is the more interesting because the author is sensible of many of the difficulties of the problem, and makes no attempt to minimize them or explain them away.

The main body of the book is divided into four parts. The first of these deals with the American Revolution, and presents, not a history of that struggle, but a history of the political ideas on the relations between the mother country and the colonies which preceded and accompanied that struggle. The author shows how general was the feeling in England that the colonies "must be dependent in all points upon the Mother Country, or else not belong to it at all," and how this antithesis led to irreconcilable claims which resulted finally in the independence of the United States. He points out that this came about without any pre-existing desire for separation on the part of the colonies. He discusses the prevalent distinction between the regulation of commerce and taxation for revenue, and quotes statements of Grenville, Burke, Jefferson, Franklin, and many others, on the true constitutional position of the British Parliament and the colonial legislatures. His conclusion of the matter is contained in the following paragraph (p. 88):

"In short the whole problem of the relation of a colony to the Mother Country, in such a way as to reconcile the theoretic claim of the Imperial Parliament to supremacy with the practical autonomy of the colonies, which has since then been slowly worked out, was presented for immediate solution to a generation insufficiently equipped by experience or reflection to solve it."

The second part of the book treats of Canada, and traces its history from the time of the conquest—dealing, of course, at some length with Lord Durham's famous report, and the ultimate fulfilment of his recommendations for government by a responsible ministry in the days of his son-in-law, Lord Elgin. This story is well and interestingly told, and is an excellent summary of the history of the growth of self-government in Canada. It ends with a chapter on the creation of the Dominion by the British North American Act of 1867; and we may note here that the texts both of this Act and of the new Commonwealth of Australia Act of 1900, with which some comparisons are made, are printed in full in appendices to the book.

Part the third deals with the history of the union with Ireland, and the question of Home Rule; and in it the author dwells upon the objections to Mr. Gladstone's two measures arising from the fact they retained in the imperial Parliament the control of the English and Scotch affairs, so that the Irish were either to have no representation in that Parliament, or else were to have a voice in the domestic policy of the other two kingdoms. In short, his objection to the measures rests on the ground that they would have given an exceptional position to Ireland without establishing a true confederation; and he quotes leading opponents of Home Rule in favor of a real federal system. He urges as the true solution of the problem a system in which England, Scotland, Ireland, and possibly Wales, should bear the same relation to a central authority that the provinces in Canada do to the Dominion.

The fourth and last part of the book is devoted to the present problem of the Empire. The author recognizes that the existing condition is unsatisfactory. "That the present system" he says (p. 273) "has hitherto worked well is due partly to the fact that the colonies are only of late coming of age, and partly to the fact that, since the Crimea, England has engaged in no war with a Great Power, nor with a great rival since Trafalgar, and that foreign policy has run tolerably smoothly." At the same time, he perceives the obstacles, economic and financial, that stand in the way of any change. He sees that the colonies want discriminating duties in their favor which it is difficult for England to grant; and that, on the other hand, they contribute very little to the military defence of the Empire, which they must do if they are to be admitted to real partnership. He sees also the political difficulties in the way of a closer union, for he shows the futility of proposing to give the colonies representatives in the existing Parliament of the United Kingdom, and adds that a federal Parliament for the whole Empire will for a long time, at least, remain impossible. The solution he offers is that of Mr.

Chamberlain, a council of delegates plenipotentiary from the different parts of the Empire. Such a council, according to Mr. Holland, would resemble the German *Bundesrath*; but it would probably be more nearly akin to the Diet of the old Germanic Confederation than the Federal Council of the present Empire. In fact, an organization so constituted would necessarily be very loose.

Like almost all writers on the subject, Mr. Holland does not appear to be sufficiently alive to two factors in the problem. One is, that as in the case of most other recent confederations, considerable sacrifices, real or apparent, will be necessary on the part of the members of the Empire if any true federal government is to be attained. The other is, that the United Kingdom and the English-speaking colonies are not the whole, they are in fact a small part, of the Empire; and it cannot be assumed that the position of the rest will settle itself. In the "General Observations" with which the book opens, Mr. Holland remarks (p. 14): "In the British Empire, apart from India, we have learned by a most costly experience, to concede to the colonies the fullest liberty consistent with the maintenance of the common tie." But this is in fact true only of a small part of the colonies. Leaving out not only India, but all those colonies adjacent to India, such as Ceylon and the Federated Malay states, the vast proportion of the people of the English dependencies have not self-government. The population of the West Indies, Egypt, and the English possessions in tropical Africa, far outnumbered that of Canada, Australia and the Cape; and it is by no means clear that the placing upon a satisfactory footing of the relations between England and the colonies with a responsible government, difficult as that is, would solve the problem of the British Empire.

A. L. LOWELL.

Oxford Studies. By JOHN RICHARD GREEN. Edited by Mrs. J. R. GREEN, and Miss K. NORGATE. (London: Macmillan and Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. xxxii, 302.)

ONLY the first of these papers can be regarded as strictly historical. The rest are collections of the anecdotes and gossip of Oxford in the eighteenth century which was the nadir of academic decadence or of the social and economical peculiarities of the period. The first paper deals with the infancy of the medieval city, a subject on which Mr. Green's authority is first rate. Perhaps it is his antiquarian bias that makes him rather espouse the cause of the city against the university. He seems to think that the university stunted the growth of the city, stifled its municipal liberties, and prevented it from becoming a commercial center. What should have made Oxford a commercial center? Its district is purely agricultural. It is on the Thames; but so are other towns in the district, such as Abingdon and Wallingford, which nevertheless have not become commercial centers. What but the university in fact has been the making of Oxford? The boarding of so many students must surely have been a considerable article of commerce. That municipal authority should have to yield something to the exigencies of academical discipline

seems no great evil. In the eighteenth century the city council of Oxford topped the height of parliamentary corruption by openly putting its representation up for sale.

The Norman Conquest in Mr. Green's opinion brought with it a sudden outburst of industrial effort, a sudden expansion of commerce, and accumulation of wealth. The blessing came to Oxford in disguise, for, as Mr. Green says in his history, the number of houses marked "waste" in the survey marks the terrible suffering of Oxford in the Norman Conquest.

The most curious part of Mr. Green's picture of the ancient city is the description of the Jewry, which will serve, if it is still necessary, to correct common ideas of the position and attitude of the medieval Jew.

"The most characteristic result of the Conquest was planted in the very heart of the town in the settlement of the Jew. Here as elsewhere the Jewry was a town within a town, with its own language, its own religion and law, its peculiar commerce, its peculiar dress. The policy of our foreign Kings secured each Hebrew settlement from the common taxation, the common justice, the common obligations of Englishmen. No city bailiff could penetrate into the square of little streets which lay behind the present Town-hall; the Church itself was powerless against the synagogue that rose in haughty rivalry beside the cloister of St. Frideswide. The picture which Scott has given us in *Ivanhoe* of Isaac of York, timid, silent, crouching under oppression, accurately as it represents our modern notions of the position of his race during the Middle Ages, is far from being borne out by historical fact. In England at least the attitude of the Jew is almost to the end an attitude of proud and even insolent defiance. His extortion was sheltered from the common law. His bonds were kept under the royal seal. A royal commission visited with heavy penalties any outbreak of violence against these 'chattels' of the king. The thunders of the Church broke vainly on the yellow gaberdine of the Jew. In a well-known story of Eadmer's, the Red King actually forbids the conversion of a Jew to the Christian faith: it was a poor exchange which would have robbed him of a valuable property and given him only a subject.

"At Oxford the attitude of the Jewry towards the national religion showed a marked consciousness of this royal protection. Prior Philip of St. Frideswide complains bitterly of a certain Hebrew with the odd name of 'Deus-cum-crescat,' who stood at his door as the procession of the saint passed by, mocking at the miracles wrought at her shrine. Halting and then walking firmly on his feet, showing his hands clenched as if with palsy and then flinging open his fingers, the mocking Jew claimed gifts and oblations from the crowd who flocked to St. Frideswide's on the ground that such recoveries of limb and strength were quite as real as any Frideswide had wrought. But though sickness and death, in the prior's story, avenge the insult of his shrine, no earthly power, ecclesiastical or civil, seems to have ventured to meddle with 'Deus cum-crescat'. The feud between the priory and the Jewry went on unchecked for a century more, to culminate in a daring act of fanaticism on the Ascension day of 1262. As the usual procession of scholars and citizens returned from St. Frideswide, a Jew suddenly burst from the group of his comrades in front of the synagogue, and snatching the crucifix from its bearer trod it under foot. But even in presence of such an outrage as

this the terror of the Crown shielded the Jewry from any outburst of popular indignation. The sentence of the King condemned the Jews of Oxford to erect a cross of marble on the spot where the crime was committed; but even this was remitted in part, and a less offensive place was allotted for the cross in an open plot by Merton College."

Mr. Green is not alone in ascribing the great ecclesiastical buildings as well as the great castles to the money bags of the Jewish capitalist. It may have been so, but has any distinct proof been produced? In the Chronicle of Jocelyn de Brakelond we have a monastery borrowing of a Jew, as is known to the readers of *Past and Present*. But the Jews were banished from England by Edward I. in 1290; with which date the outlay on the building and extension of ecclesiastical edifices certainly did not cease. The date of the building of Salisbury Cathedral is 1220 to 1258, within the Jewish period; but, if Murray's *Handbook to the Cathedrals* is to be trusted, we know whence the money came. The sum (40,000 marks) was raised by contributions from the prebendaries themselves; by collections from different dioceses, to each of which a prebendary of Salisbury was sent; and by liberal grants from various benefactors, such as Alicia de Bruere, who gave all the stone necessary for the work during twelve years. The general influence of Jewish capital is not doubtful. But in the case of ecclesiastical buildings the Church had in popular faith a great bank on which to draw.

At the origin of the university Mr. Green barely glances. In fact almost nothing can be known. The millenary of Alfred has called attention to his legendary character as founder. Popular fancy ascribes great institutions to great men. It ascribed to Alfred trial by jury, and the division of the shires. But it was the legend that caused the interpolation in Asser's Chronicle, not the interpolation in Asser's Chronicle that gave birth to the legend. Nor is there any real ground for suspecting of fabrication so respectable an antiquary as Camden.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

Essays in Historical Criticism. By EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE. [Yale Bicentennial Publications.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xii, 304.)

NOT infrequently busy professors, who cannot find time for large compositions yet cannot be content to permit all their work to remain in an ephemeral form, rescue their articles from journals and make of them a book. Such books are likely to be distinctly miscellaneous, and Professor Bourne's is no exception to the rule. Yet there is a certain unity. The title well expresses it, and characterizes the writer, for in all his historical writing thus far published Mr. Bourne has revealed himself chiefly as a keen and accomplished historical critic.

But the phrase "historical criticism" has in current use more than one meaning. The professional student ordinarily uses it as meaning the critical discussion or dissection of the original sources or materials of history. Five of the essays in this volume are of this variety: the long dis-

cussion of "The Legend of Marcus Whitman" which occupies more than a third of the volume; two shorter essays on the vexed question of the authorship of certain numbers of the *Federalist*; and others, still more brief, on Madison's studies in the history of Federal government and on a passage in Seneca which has long been misinterpreted into a hint of the possibility of a westward voyage to the Indies. It is in historical criticism in this sense that Mr. Bourne, to the mind of the present reviewer, shows himself most acute and skilful. He has also a most remarkable gift of *Heuristik*. It is a modest and elusive book or bit of evidence that can escape his drag-net whence once he has roused himself to the task of sifting a historical statement to the bottom.

Another sense in which an article may be called an essay in historical criticism is that of an historical narrative based on such careful critical work as that to which we have adverted. Three examples of this sort stand in the book before us: a capital study of Prince Henry the Navigator, especially endeavoring to define his aims and methods; a thorough discussion of the demarcation line of Pope Alexander VI. and of the other definitions of boundary between the colonial possessions of Spain and those of Portugal; and the highly important and instructive paper on the "Proposed Absorption of Mexico in 1847-1848" which was printed in the fifth volume of this REVIEW. Critical estimates of historians may perhaps, though certainly in a less usual sense of the phrase, be called essays in historical criticism. Of these there are three. The best is an essay on Ranke, the careful and appreciative address which Mr. Bourne read before the American Historical Association in 1895. Those on Parkman and Froude are well written, but much slighter. The essay on Ranke's relations to the beginning of the seminary method in teaching history contains some repetition of matter already presented in that on Ranke, but it is in itself an excellent contribution.

Recurring to those parts of this handsome volume which consist of historical criticism in the stricter, or at any rate in the more technical sense, the reviewer feels obliged to say that to his mind Mr. Bourne's arguments respecting Madison's authorship of several of the disputed numbers of the *Federalist*, arguments from internal evidence, first published in this journal, seem practically conclusive. Those relating to the other numbers are almost as cogent, if indeed we may not say that all stand or fall together.

The *pièce de résistance* of the volume is the Whitman essay. Its criticisms of that famous legend have been developed much beyond the form in which they were originally published; and a much fuller history of the process by which it was disseminated is now presented. One cannot fail to admire the gifts of search which have enabled the writer to bring to bear upon his problem, with telling effect, bits of evidence from sources the most diverse. In some cases one feels that the cogency of the evidence is a little overestimated. But on the whole, in the judgment of the present reviewer, Mr. Bourne has abundantly proved his main contention. The Whitman legend is fatally damaged, so far as any

use of it by trained historical students is concerned. It cannot be upheld without ignoring the inferiority of long-subsequent recollections to contemporary documents as sources of history, an inferiority which the lay mind perpetually underestimates, but which the expert knows, by many striking instances, to be enormous. But the passionate revilings to which we have seen the accomplished critic subjected in many newspapers make it plain that the legend will die hard.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

A History of Political Theories, Ancient and Mediæval. By WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, Ph.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. xxv, 360.)

It is rather remarkable that the historians of America should have shown themselves so apathetic in tracing the origin and history of those theories of the state which found a brief expression in the Declaration of Independence. In his *Essays on Government* Professor Lowell does not go back of Hooker, and until the appearance of the present work there was no good treatise in English on the political theories of ancient and mediæval times. Professor Dunning begins his book with Homer and concludes it with Machiavelli, limiting his considerations to Aryan peoples. Even within these limits he does not pretend to make the work an exhaustive treatise of the theories of all writers on the state, but selects those theorists who best represent the characteristics of political thought in the periods which he considers.

The author further limits the scope of his work by omitting all questions of ethics in relation to politics, and by confining himself to a consideration of "political theory in its relation to political fact". In accordance with such limitation we find each period of the work prefaced by an account of the political events and conditions of the times preceding and during the lives of the various theorists under consideration. The extremes of Athenian democracy are shown to have turned Plato to Spartan ideals, as the failure of the latter influenced Aristotle to favor democracy; while the city-state as the unit of government of the times formed the political horizon of both men. The interest of the Romans in the practical art of government blinded the learned among them to considerations of theory, and Polybius and Cicero did scarcely more than reproduce and develop Greek ideas. The Stoic philosophy and Christianity emphasized the ideas of equality and the brotherhood of man at a time when a way was being made for the establishment of the Roman papacy and the Holy Roman Empire. The later conflicts between these two forces of mediæval life determined the course which political speculation should take until the times of Machiavelli. This man, having in mind the fight for nationalities and the maintenance of one state against another rather than the struggles for supremacy between the ecclesiastical and temporal powers, was the first to abandon the threadbare theories of the papal and imperial protagonists, and the first to make a study of the

actual conditions in a state in order to prescribe rules for the preservation and expansion of its power.

Within the limits set, Professor Dunning's work is unimpeachable, but fault may be found with the limits. Protagoras, the first to expound the social compact theory of the origin of the state, is entirely overlooked. It is to be regretted that the author has not overridden the tradition which gives such a prominent place to Plato in works on political theory. With the most liberal interpretation of the word theory it is difficult to see how his writings can be classed with works other than those on utopias. Along the same line of definition of terms Aristotle's interesting economic ideas of barter, money, etc. (p. 60 ff.) scarcely command consideration in a work on political theory. Unoriginal as Cicero is accused of being, his ideas show an advance over those of his Greek predecessors, and he certainly deserves more than the scant treatment which Professor Dunning gives him.

In that portion of the work which deals with the early conflict of the papal and imperial powers, the author, in his efforts to bring forcibly before the reader the most characteristic theories used by one side or the other to prove its superiority, omits mention of other important theories of the time, especially those about the origin of the state. Unhistorical as the doctrine of the social compact is, it certainly deserves more consideration than Professor Dunning gives it, both for its influence on history and for the theories which grew out of it. The definite expression of it in St. Augustine's *Confessions*, a work which Professor Dunning does not consider, gave to the papal party a weapon of the greatest utilitarian importance. It was obvious that if the state were so mundane in its origin, the divine power of the Pope was certainly superior to that of the Emperor.

In discussing Aquinas's ideas of tyrannicide (p. 200), the author, in showing that St. Thomas did not believe that tyrants should be killed by private individuals, fails to bring out that he did think that they could be justly overthrown by the community. Again, in connection with Cusanus's happy phrasing of the necessity of the consent of the governed to the making of laws (pp. 273-274), it is too strong to say that he was the first to bring this principle into politics proper. Rather, he was the first to derive such a principle from the theory that all men in a state of nature are equal.

The excellent appreciation of Machiavelli does not belong in a work on political theory any more than does a treatise on the ideal social and political reconstructions of Plato. Dr. Dunning acknowledges that Machiavelli has to do with *Politik* rather than with *Staatslehre* and still he gives him a place in his book, in deference no doubt to the tradition which has always given him consideration in works on political theory. It is time he was dropped from such, for his studies in practical politics have little to do with theories of the state. Bodin then, rather than Machiavelli, should stand at the threshold of the political theory of modern times.

At the end of each chapter select references are placed for the benefit of those who wish to find the theories treated in more detail, and at the end of the book is a bibliography of texts and of historical and descriptive works concerning political theory. Bibliographical works such as those of Engelmann and Potthast are not given. Figgis's *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings*, Scaduto, *Stato e Chiesa negli Scritti Politici* and Littlejohn, *The Political Theory of the Schoolmen and Grotius* might have been mentioned. It certainly was an oversight to omit Rehm's excellent work, *Geschichte der Staatsrechtswissenschaft*. (Freiburg, 1896.)

It is to be hoped that many will be stimulated to further researches in the field which Professor Dunning has treated so attractively. In it there is great room for original investigation, for there is scarcely a library of manuscripts in Europe which has not one or more unpublished works on the state.

JAMES SULLIVAN.

New Tales of Old Rome. By RODOLFO LANCIANI. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1901. Pp. xii, 336.)

IN 1899-1890 Professor Lanciani delivered the Gifford lectures at the University of St. Andrews, and this book contains such parts of those lectures as refer to recent archaeological and historical research in Rome, and have not appeared in any of the author's previous publications. The titles of the chapters will give a general idea of their contents. They are "The New Discoveries in the Forum and on the Sacra Via," "The Sacred Grove of the Arvales," "The Truth about the Grave of St. Paul," "Strange Superstitions in Rome," and "Jewish, English and Scottish Memorials in Rome." Under these comprehensive titles, a heterogeneous mass of archaeological lore, classical and medieval, is exhibited with much charm of style, but in an unsystematic manner. Thus in the chapter on "Strange Superstitions" the bare mention of the national gods of foreign soldiers quartered in Rome is the occasion for a long digression upon the *equites singulares*, and the description of the sanctuary of Diana at Nemi introduces an eight-page discussion of the fragments of the two ships found in Lake Nemi. This digression has, to be sure, some excuse in the author's curious theory that these ships were connected with the worship of the goddess. The first chapter deals with the most ancient remains on the Comitium, but its last six pages are devoted to the story of Pasquino and Marforio.

Lanciani takes his stand definitely with the so-called conservative school of Italian archaeologists, and actually prints Ceci's interpretation of the inscription on the stele—an interpretation which was immediately rejected as being pure fancy—as well as that redoubtable person's diatribe against foreign scholars. Lanciani himself joins in this attack, but naïvely confesses (p. 25) "We do not know whether Professor Ceci is right or not!"

Lanciani believes that we have, in the ancient tufa structure beneath the *lapis niger*, the actual tomb or heroön of Romulus, which became an object of popular worship by the end of the seventh century B. C., and

was gradually covered with a layer of sacrificial debris. After the invasion of the Gauls, and the raising of the level of the Forum, ex-voto offerings were thrown into the surrounding *fossae*, and at a still later date, these *fossae* were emptied and their contents heaped upon the heroön. In this way he attempts to explain the presence of fragments demonstrably belonging to the last century of the Republic. The decisive objection to this view is the fact that the latest fragments were found mixed with the earliest through the whole mass, showing that no part of it was the result of gradual accumulation.

The author also thinks that the archaic inscription dates from about 600 B. C., but this is probably a century too early. His belief that the Capitoline wolf stood on the pedestal dedicated by Maxentius to Mars Invictus, and found on the Comitium, has not met with general acceptance. In the fourth chapter, which contains a description of the Basilica Æmilia and a history of the church of S. Paolo fuori le Mura, Lanciani calls attention to the fact that he has always been of the opinion that the twenty-four columns of pavonazetto which stood in the church before its destruction in 1823, came from this basilica, but he omits to state that the evidence of the ruins themselves, so far as they have been excavated, is decidedly against his position.

This book will be useful to the general reader who has some knowledge of Roman antiquities, but not to the student or specialist. It is interesting, as all of Lanciani's books are, but inferior to his earlier works in many respects, especially in its lack of system and failure to distinguish clearly between fact and fancy. So eminent a topographer may be pardoned, perhaps, for maintaining his own views, even when they have been rejected by the great majority of scholars, but hardly for such carelessness as is displayed in the following contradictory statements. When speaking for the first time of the round mass of concrete which stands in the niche of the temple of Cæsar, he calls it the "base of the Julian pillar," and says (p. 20): "The pedestal of this column is still to be seen in a semi-circular recess in front of the temple of Cæsar, as is shown in the cut below." On page 80 we read: "It [*i. e.*, the spot where Cæsar's body was burned] is marked by an altar—or, to speak more accurately, by the core of an altar—built of concrete with chips of Numidian marble, that is, with the fragments of the original column set up on the site of the incineration and overthrown by Dolabella!"

The Marquis d'Argenson and Richard II. By REGINALD RANKIN. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1901. Pp. xxxii, 300.)

CONSIDERED from a literary standpoint these two essays are just what we should expect from the author's previous work. The style is clear and elegant, the logic seems convincing and the work abounds in fine figures of speech and deftly used quotations. But the value of the work as a contribution to science leaves room for some criticism.

"The Causes of the Fall of Richard II.," the longer of the two

essays, is a subject upon which much light is needed. Nearly all of the original sources of information—chronicles, as well as state papers, and contemporary poetry—were either written after the accession of Henry IV. or else altered to suit the change in dynasty. The present views of a revolution as important as that of 1688 are based chiefly on this hostile evidence and they would certainly be modified by a careful critique of the sources. Far from giving us such a critique, the author has not even attempted the briefest description of the sources used. His usual method is to cite a single authority for some important statement, but without referring to other testimony or placing the reader in a position to judge of the value of his citation. He often fails to discriminate between contemporaries and authors of the following centuries, often citing the latter when their own sources were available (pp. 156, 242, 243, 244, 251). There are also little negligences in citations which might easily have been avoided. For example, pages of the references are omitted (pp. 155, 214, 246) and a long note is practically copied from Stubbs without acknowledgment (p. 298; cf. Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, II. 476).

In consequence of these methods Richard II. fares even worse than in the usual version. True, his troubles were inherited rather than of his own making, and the beautiful words which Shakespeare puts into his mouth form the keynote of the narrative. (*Richard II.*, V. I.) His personality was the chief cause of his downfall, arguments being even drawn from his appearance, as preserved in surviving portraits. There were no redeeming features in his character (p. 173). His policy of balancing the Lollards against the hierarchy lost the support of both parties, and he is even charged with leaning towards Lollardy, no notice being taken of Mr. Trevelyan's convincing proof of the contrary (*Age of Wycliffe*, 310, 329). A chapter is devoted to Richard's favorites, but without sufficient consideration of the fact that their influence was remote, since they were executed or banished in 1386, excepting John of Gaunt, whose active part in politics had ceased in 1381, when the King was thirteen years old. Richard's French policy indeed made him enemies, but he should also receive credit for the fact that his obligations to his allies, the state of England, and the attitude of the Commons on money grants, rendered it the wisest course to pursue.

In the chapter on "The People" Mr. Rankin attempts to show that the fall of Richard was largely due to the revolutionary ideas of 1381. This is done by reference to a spurious confession of Jack Strawe, but no notice is taken of the fact that the demands of the insurgents contemplated a popular absolute monarchy (*AM. HIST. REV.*, VII. 283-284); that Richard distinctly favored the lower classes when he proposed the emancipation of serfs to Parliament in 1381, and when in 1391 he vetoed a petition of the Commons to prevent them from educating their children. Another chapter treats the important part of the Parliament in Richard's downfall, and the last is devoted to Henry of Lancaster. In him the author sees a skilful conspirator who from the beginning aimed at the throne. But, in reality, several unforeseen events made Henry, the

King's ardent supporter, a pretendant to the throne: his unexpected banishment, the death of the heir apparent (the Earl of March) in Ireland, and of John of Gaunt in England. Mr. Rankin's brilliant essay is, on the whole, little more than a development of the usual views already expressed by Stubbs, and it throws practically no new light on the revolution of 1399.

This lack of critical method, with its attendant results, is not so apparent in "Le Marquis d'Argenson." In this instance the materials consist chiefly of that statesman's *Memoirs* and *Traité de Politique*, and the task does not involve a comparative criticism of the sources. In the chapter on "D'Argenson the Man" the author, while not sparing his hero's weaknesses, does full justice to his sterling honesty and indefatigable industry. "D'Argenson the Statesman" is an account of his failure as foreign minister (1744-1747), due to his conservatism in adhering to the ancient policy of hostility to Austria, and to his lack of practical ability as a statesman. The author justly observes that he would have made a better *premier ministre*; but whether "he would be remembered as a greater than Turgot" is very doubtful. For d'Argenson was great as a theorist, and not as a practical statesman. In "D'Argenson the Philosopher," we are given an account of his religious and political views, which form a curious combination of the old and the new. He subordinated the church to the crown: "L'église est dans l'état"—and the King is its head. He believed in an absolute monarchy, but in local self-government of a democratic character. He advocated just schemes of local taxation with heaviest incidence upon luxuries, peasant proprietorship of land and absolute *laissez-faire* in matters of internal trade. We cannot but admire the political foresight of a man who foretold the French Revolution and its effects, the independence of the American colonies, the union and freedom of Italy, and the construction of the Suez canal.

GEORGE KRIEHN.

Découverte et Évolution Cartographique de Terre-Neuve et des Pays Circonvoisins, 1497-1501-1769. Par HENRY HARRISSE. (London: Henry Stevens, Son and Stiles. 1901. Pp. 420.)

THOSE who have disagreed most radically with the opinions advocated by Mr. HARRISSE in regard to John and Sebastian Cabot will be foremost in welcoming the latest volume from the acknowledged master of all that concerns the history of American discovery. Since 1897, except for a short excursus into the career of a French lithographer, Mr. HARRISSE's publications have been entirely devoted to the Cabot controversies, a subject which was repeatedly on the verge of degenerating into personalities. He now returns to the methods and the subject of some of his very best earlier work, and all who care for American beginnings will rejoice at the proof that the master's eye is as keen, his grasp of the significant details as strong, his command of the literature, printed and manuscript, written and drawn, as thorough and comprehensive as ever before. Three years ago there was a temptation to speak of Mr. Har-

risse as an old man, out of temper with those who would not agree with his dicta. It is nearly fifty years since, in 1854, his first published writings appeared, but his latest book, embodying an exhaustive analysis of the ways by which geographers learned how to portray the contours of Newfoundland, is the work of a man still in his prime. With three further essays about to appear, students may hopefully look forward to learning much from him, who has mastered the most crabbed text of American history more thoroughly than any of the others that have contributed to the unravelling of the perplexing problems of how Europe came to know America.

Mr. Harrisse's *Terre-Neuve* is intended to be an illustration of how geographical history should be studied. The subject is one with which he has been familiar for thirty years, since the days when he utilized the leisure enforced by the encompassing German army, in searching through the Paris archives for material relating to New France. The *Notes* embodying the results of this investigation appeared in 1872. Ten years later he published his first Cabot volume, followed in 1883 by *Les Côte Real*. The magnificent *Discovery of North America*, issued in 1892, brought together the results of all his previous studies, the northeastern coast sharing with the Gulf of Mexico the largest part of his attention. An examination of these successive volumes shows clearly how his appreciation of the importance of the maps cotemporary with the voyages of discovery has grown steadily, until now, in his *Terre-Neuve*, he frankly abandons the ordinary sources of information and undertakes to find out what there is to be learned from an exhaustive study of the cartographical documents. Starting with the earliest American maps, the La Cosa, Cantino, and Canerio, he traces the growth of Portuguese interest in the northwestern Atlantic, with the accompanying failure of the English to take advantage of their earlier information, apparently because they found they could make more money in buying and trading the fish caught by the Biscayans, Bretons, and Azores men. The French seem to have been the first to establish themselves with winter quarters on the shore, and they were the leaders in following along the coast into the gulf behind the island and on up the St. Lawrence. As the possibilities of the fur trade came to be realized, the fisheries lost their preponderating importance, and the consequent falling off in the attention paid to the sea-coast was reflected during the later sixteenth century by a growing uncertainty in the configuration on the maps. Cartier's discovery of the entrance through the straits of Belle Isle misled the map-makers, already puzzled by the confusing irregularities in the coast to the south, into inferring that the whole Newfoundland region was an archipelago. For nearly fifty years this region was represented as a group of a dozen or twenty small islands, which were gradually solidified into three, as authentic information was received showing that one and another supposed passage was in reality a closed bay. Eventually the single triangular land mass reappeared, and then the geographical problems became simpler. It was not until 1751, however, when the Marquis de Chabert made a

voyage in Newfoundland and Acadian waters for the special purpose of rectifying the errors in existing charts, that the island began to assume the detailed character it has on modern maps. In 1762 James Cook, a young naval surveyor who later became the famous navigator, was assigned to duty in these waters with instructions to produce an accurate map. The result of his work forms the basis for the current Admiralty charts, and with this Mr. HARRISSE appropriately closes his study.

The majority of students upon opening this volume will look first at the chapters in which Mr. HARRISSE, for at least the fifteenth time, returns to a consideration of the Cabot discovery. The result, with those who have followed the animated discussions for the past five years, will probably be mingled surprise and admiration. Few would have guessed from the acrimony of 1898-1900 that Henry HARRISSE would turn to meet his opponents half way, with a virtual offer to let the disputes rest where they are. It is not to be expected of either side that any contentions will be withdrawn. All will agree, however, with his frank acknowledgment that none of the evidence so far recovered is sufficiently definite to settle the disputed points beyond question, so that all differences are matters of quite justifiable personal opinion. He speaks of Cabot's landfall as on the Labrador coast, but he then goes on to state the evidence and the arguments which make that location virtually impossible. He says that Cabot did not see Newfoundland in 1497, but he also gives an elaborate, unluckily not quite a convincing, argument that La Cosa's chart of 1500 is based entirely, for this region, upon Cabot's first voyage, and moreover, that La Cosa's northeastern American coast line represents what can only be the actual coast of Cape Breton eastward to Cape Race. Oddly enough, he does not even hint at the obvious point that if Cabot made an extended voyage in 1498, he must have seen the island in that year. However pronounced one's personal opinions may be, it is impossible not to recognize that Mr. HARRISSE has with great fairness presented the essential facts as they were understood before the Cabot centenary discussions began, and as they are still retained by the few unprejudiced students of the subject who have kept out of the heat of the conflict.

GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP.

Le Parlement de Paris ; son Rôle Politique depuis le Règne de Charles VII jusqu'à la Révolution. Par E. GLASSON. In two volumes. (Paris : Hachette. 1901. Pp. ii, 469 ; 516.)

ON the origin, organization and procedure of the Parliament of Paris much has been written ; there are the excellent volumes of Aubert ; there is M. Glasson's own account in his *Histoire du Droit et des Institutions de la France*. It is therefore to the "neglected or badly understood" political activity of the Parliament and its relations with the absolute monarchy that M. Glasson has now devoted two volumes.

In the first chapter, which rapidly runs over two centuries and is more in the nature of an introduction to the detailed study which begins with the reign of Henry IV., M. Glasson shows that in the time of

Charles VII., the Parliament of Paris had no political power and wished for none. The political rôle of the Parliament really begins in the sixteenth century, when Francis I. invited its assistance in several public matters in which he needed support, such as the repression of the Huguenots and the annulment of the Treaty of Madrid. He recognized, too, the *droit de remontrance*. Under his weak successors the Parliament began to interfere on its own initiative in matters of state; it successfully opposed the encroachments of Rome upon the Gallican Church, and by defending the rights of the crown against the attacks of the League did a real service to the monarchy. But when the magistrates thought to exert their political power by opposing the Edict of Nantes, Henry IV. summoned them to him, talked to them "*comme un père de famille*", and reminded them that they were a court of justice and not a political body. The Parliament yielded, and, without abdicating its pretensions, awaited a more favorable opportunity to make them good. This opportunity came with the King's assassination; on the same day the Parliament voted that the regency should belong to Mary de' Medici.

The final disappearance in 1614 of the States-General, which was the only possible political rival of the Parliament of Paris, the rapidly increasing solidarity of the *noblesse de robe* since the introduction of the *paulette*, and, most important of all, the long weak regencies following the deaths of Henry IV. and Louis XIII. gave the Parliament its chance to take a serious part in political affairs and for a moment in the Fronde really to limit the monarchy by a short-lived charter of liberties. That the Parliament of Paris was ultimately defeated in the Fronde and reduced to political impotence when Louis XIV. reached his majority, M. Glasson believes was due to nothing so much as to the blunders of the magistrates themselves: to their short-sighted alliance with the nobles who exploited Parliament's opposition to Mazarin for their own selfish ends; to their habit of suspending all justice until their remonstrances had been listened to; and to their continual refusal to register sensible financial edicts which were necessary for the conduct of the government and the successful conclusion of the war with Spain. Their defeat was emphatically signalled in the famous Bed of Justice where Louis XIV. suddenly entered the Palace of Justice in his hunting costume, and in the energetic words which have been reduced to the apocryphal *L'état c'est moi* gave his Parliament to understand that during his reign justice alone and not politics was to be their concern.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, for a third time, the minority of the King gave the Parliament a chance to regain political power. At the request of the Duke of Orleans it overthrew the provisions of Louis XIV.'s testament, made Orleans regent, and received in return from him a recognition of the right of remonstrance and certain other privileges which had been taken away by the absolute Louis XIV. Henry IV. and Louis XIV. by their spirit of justice and good administration had made the absolute monarchy respected; Louis XV., willing to reign but not to govern, made it detested, and this too at a moment

when the new philosophy was beginning to question the basis of the monarchy itself. The magistrates, indoctrinated with Montesquieu and Rousseau, began to show a wholly new tendency in the latter part of Louis XV.'s reign; no longer confining themselves to opposition on questions of finance and religion, they set forth in long remonstrances "fundamental laws" which were subversive of the absolute monarchy and helped prepare the revolution. Maupeou saw the danger and did not hesitate boldly to suppress the Parliament of Paris with its "fundamental laws"; he replaced it with a court of his own creation, in which the venality and many other abuses of the old Parliament were swept away. The new judges were men of moderation and good sense and would, M. Glasson believes, if retained by Louis XVI., have seconded Turgot and helped the government to carry through the indispensable reforms. But Louis XVI., with his fatal weakness of will, contrary to his own better judgment, yielded to the wishes of the people, exiled Maupeou to his estate, dismissed his good parliament, and restored the old Parliament of Paris with all its prejudices, abuses, and factious spirit of systematic opposition. As Turgot had clearly foreseen, and warned the King, the Parliament bitterly opposed the great reform edicts, and sooner or later came into conflict with all the succeeding ministers. It was unable to reform any of the abuses of the Old Régime itself and it systematically refused to lend a helping hand to the monarchy in its attempt to do so. Finally it lost all credit with the people because it demanded that in the meeting of the States-General the forms of 1614 should be observed, intending thereby to secure that predominance of the clergy and nobility over the Third Estate which the magistrates believed the best guarantee for the maintenance of the system of privilege. During the remaining months of its existence, until placed in permanent vacation by the National Assembly in October, 1789, the Parliament had no political influence.

All the ideas which M. Glasson has spread over his two volumes might well have been put within the compass of one. Where an author has used manuscript sources, that are not easily accessible, he may well insert quotations from them in an appendix or foot-notes; but where, as in this case, the author has been content with the printed material,—M. Glasson has not even consulted the registers of the Parliament itself,—there is no excuse for the continual interjection into the text of long quotations from such well-known, but often very partizan, memoirs as those of Molé, Omer Talon, Retz, St. Simon, and Barbier. M. Glasson's book will, nevertheless, be found interesting and useful to students of the absolute monarchy in France.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

Carácter de la Conquista Española en América y en México según los Textos de los Historiadores Primitivos. Por GENARO GARCÍA. (México: Oficina Tipográfica de la Secretaría de Fomento. 1901. Pp. 456.)

THE Spanish conquest of Mexico is one of those episodes that have been chosen by students of history as a sort of landmark, in regard to which it is necessary to discover the exact truth in every detail, in order that it may be used as a basis by which to estimate the relative truth of statements regarding all the surrounding events. It is fortunate that the rest of Spanish American history has not been subjected to similar treatment; if it were, the chaos of conflicting and contradictory statements and opinions would be most appalling. The character of Cortés and the real course of the events in which he figured have been the subject of most diverse estimates, out of which the approximate truth is only now becoming gradually apparent. The mass of writings that have grown up about the Conquest have made it difficult to perceive the fundamental facts, although the laborious search for something upon which to establish a satisfactory opinion results in the end in giving those opinions a firmer and more permanent basis. Sr. Genaro García's *Carácter de la Conquista Española* is in many respects the most important contribution since the publication of Mr. Morgan's famous essay on "Montezuma's Dinner". Prescott, following the earlier Spanish writers, gave in English the version of the story which would, it may be surmised, have best pleased the direct descendants of the conquerors. Mr. Morgan and Mr. A. F. Bandelier, by showing what sort of people the conquered natives really were, added an essential factor to the complete understanding of the course of events. Sr. García has now undertaken to show how the Spanish conquerors actually conducted themselves. What still remains to be done is to rewrite the whole story from the point of view of unbiased history, doing equal justice to conquered and conquerors, and keeping ever in mind the way in which each side looked upon its own actions as well as upon those of its enemies.

Sr. García's volume for the first time comes within measurable distance of a definitive understanding of the most perplexing, because the most completely known, episode in Spanish-American history. By keeping close to the elementary sources of information, extracts from which make up the bulk of his volume, he provides material for an independent judgment, both of the actual facts and of his own treatment of them. That the result is not favorable to the Spanish character will be readily guessed. Sr. García shows, by quoting the things which they said about themselves, that the "Conquistadores" and the priests and administrators who solidified the work of the soldiers, were guilty of every species of brutality and useless cruelty towards their fellow Spaniards as well as towards the natives, whose guileless unwillingness to recognize the deceitful and untrustworthy character of the stranger white men alone explains the success of the invaders. That this is not a sufficient explana-

tion of the success is obvious. The very able and uncompromising fashion in which Sr. Garcia, himself of excellent Spanish blood, presents many of the underlying national traits, however, while it does not give all the reasons for the downfall of Motecuhzoma, does advance the understanding of these events a long way toward what is to be the final matured judgment of historical students. GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP.

The Mystery of Mary Stuart. By ANDREW LANG. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1901. Pp. xxii, 452.)

MR. LANG'S book is neither a biography of Mary nor a history of her reign. The mysteries with which he deals lie between 1561 and 1568; they concern Mary and her intimates, especially Moray, Lethington and Bothwell. To his difficult task the author has brought a singularly open mind, great critical ability, and an ingenuity not inferior to that of any of his predecessors. He does not expect finality and has not radically altered former estimates of Mary's personality and degree of guilt; but even in his "spirit of reluctant conscientiousness," he has strengthened the case against her. His contributions to the history of individual episodes and actions are of substantial worth. The full value of the work as an attempt "to show how the whole problem is affected by the discovery of the Lennox Papers" will not be accurately known until these appear in the critical edition which Father Pollen has promised. But much of the permanent value of Mr. Lang's book is altogether independent of the Lennox papers.

The book has its defects. Erroneous dates occur, but arguments are not invalidated by them. The author's dread of dogmatic statement occasionally leaves the unfortunate impression of indecision. The worst mistake in point of fact and inference relates to Mary's abduction. The Queen at Dunbar, according to the Spanish Calendar, threatened Huntly's life, if Lethington were injured. Confusing Melville's account with this, Mr. Lang substitutes Bothwell's name for Huntly's and asks—Could the Queen who said that be in love with Bothwell?

Apart from the Lennox papers, the most important fresh material which Mr. Lang produces is the suppressed passage of Hepburn of Bowton's confession, printed in the preface. If authentic—Mr. Lang accepts it, and the document of which it forms a part is attested by the autograph signature of Bellenden the justice clerk—it proves that Moray knew exactly who Darnley's murderers were, suppressed the evidence at Westminster, and prosecuted his sister, knowingly, in close alliance with two of the actual murderers.

Mr. Lang's work is largely based upon the new material in the Lennox papers, now extant in the Cambridge University Library, transcripts of which were found among the papers of the late Father Stevenson by Father Pollen and were by him transmitted to Mr. Lang. They enable him to present the most satisfactory account yet given of Lethington's tortuous policy, to state the substance of Crawford's second

deposition at Westminster, and to relate new and trenchant anecdotes illustrative of Mary and Darnley's relations at critical periods—especially at James's christening and at Kirk O'Field. Containing briefs against Mary prepared by Lennox for the instruction of the English commissioners at York, they enable Mr. Lang "to get behind the scenes and show how Mary's prosecutors managed and worked up their case." They also contain briefs given by Lennox to Buchanan: upon this material the Book of Articles is partly based and here too is the first draught of the Detection—a paper entitled "Probable and Infallyable Conjectures." It is not Mr. Lang's least service to have presented the most accurate critique of Buchanan yet attained. The Lennox papers also include material by means of which Mr. Lang strengthens the probability of Hosack's view that a forged antecedent to the Glasgow letter actually existed. Twenty-nine pages of intricate argument furnish a plausible rather than convincing case. More conclusive is the new account of the Craigmillar conference. Fresh evidence in the Lennox papers seems to warrant Mr. Lang's deduction that at Craigmillar a definite plan of procedure against Darnley was adopted with Mary's consent—viz., to arrest him for treason and to kill him if he resisted. The plan was not to be executed till after the christening. In the meantime it was discovered and abandoned. Hatred of Darnley, in Mr. Lang's opinion, sufficiently accounts for each of Mary's actions from Riccio's murder to Darnley's; love of Bothwell was not needed. He inclines to believe in her active guilt in Darnley's murder.

Mr. Lang proves that Kirk O'Field at the time of Darnley's murder lay *inside* the city walls. He also demonstrates the existence of two "bands" against Darnley in the winter of 1566-1567; the first a quasi-constitutional band to refuse administrative power; the second, the well-known murder band. Moray, man of many alibis, doubtless signed the first—certainly not the second.

Nearly one-half of Mr. Lang's book is devoted to the Casket letters. He inclines to accept their authenticity, except in minor portions. If forged, Lethington is guilty. He demonstrates that on the very day of the Casket's opening—a new and important point—the Lords sent Melville to Elizabeth with the tidings. So perish many arguments founded on the delay in their production. The Lennox papers contain the oldest extant manuscript of the Scotch version of the celebrated Glasgow letter and to that extent have assisted Mr. Lang in producing the most reliable text yet printed of the Glasgow letter and the copies of the French originals of the Casket letters. For Letters I. and II. he has evolved a new principle of criticism, destructive of many arguments, by demonstrating that no valid inferences can be drawn from discrepancies between the Scotch and English versions.

With great ingenuity Mr. Lang excels former critics of the Casket letters by bringing out two points which tend to establish the authenticity of the Glasgow letter. He justifies its internal chronology and rearranges its form. His first task is accomplished by correcting the official scheme

of dates in Cecil's journal, according to which the prosecution ruins its own case by establishing for the letter an absurd chronology and the presumption of forgery. Distinguishing sharply between the legal case and the historical case against Mary, Mr. Lang rejects the prosecution's dates and erects a provisional scheme based upon the agreement of two independent Edinburgh diaries concerning the date of an Edinburgh matter. Had Cecil's journal presented the date of the diaries, the letter's chronology would not have been open to attack.

Most critics consider the Glasgow letter the clumsy work of a forger who has cut a genuine letter into pieces and interpolated false matter. Paragraph seven concludes with the words—"The morne I wil speik to him upon this Point:" paragraph eleven ends—"This is my first jorney (day's work). I sall end ye same ye morne." Mr. Lang's explanation is simple and excludes the idea of interpolation. Mary wrote these words, consecutively, at night, the first expression at the bottom of one sheet, the other at the top of a fresh sheet. Next day she picked up the second sheet on the unused side, and continued her letter, not discovering her words of the previous night until she turned the page. She then probably ran her pen lightly through the lines, but later a bungling transcriber and translator copied the whole affair. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ.* Mr. Lang's ingenious explanation, supported by an identical instance in the case of Mary's sonnet in the Bodleian, has since acquired additional probability. The authentic manuscripts from which Father Pollen in his recent publication prints for the first time Mary's long letter to the Duke of Guise, exhibits, *mutatis mutandis*, a similar mistake on Mary's part.

O. H. RICHARDSON.

Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots during her Reign in Scotland, 1561-1567. Edited, from the original documents in the Vatican Archives and elsewhere, by JOHN HUNGERFORD POLLEN, S.J. (Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable, for the Scottish History Society. 1901. Pp. cxliii, 555.)

FATHER POLLEN'S volume contains two hundred and fifty-nine hitherto unprinted documents, edited with scrupulous care, and accompanied by accurate translations and full notes. The collection practically fills the gap which remained in the records of Mary's reign after the publication of the Spanish Calendar with the exception of her correspondence with the Cardinal of Lorraine. This Father Pollen was unable to find, and he despairs of its recovery.

The introduction to the work is itself a valuable contribution to history. It exhibits old problems in the light of the new facts and dispels many mysteries. First is disclosed the fatal weakness of French policy with respect to Scotland during the regency of Mary of Lorraine—not an out-and-out French and Roman Catholic policy, but "an endeavor to cloak a policy of compromise with the appearance of being 'thorough.' " The attempt betrayed the essential weakness of France, roused the

suspensions of both friends and foes, and led to political combinations which ruined French power in Scotland.

As to religious matters, Mary Stuart in the documents appears to rule consistently as a *politique*, not as an extremist whose ultimate endeavor was to undo the Reformation. She aimed at an English alliance, was "not oppressed by her duty as a Catholic sovereign," and seems to manifest more desire for Roman subsidies than for Roman rites. Apparently the papal diplomatists were not consulted at all about Mary's assumption of the English arms.

The strongest argument for believing that Mary signed the Catholic League disappears with the publication of a letter from Pius IV. to the Cardinal of Lorraine, dated September 25th, 1565, expressly refusing to send Mary a subsidy. In fact, Father Pollen, finding no diplomatic material at Rome or in the archives of any of the countries said to be concerned, argues conclusively enough that no such league ever existed. Absence of such documents from the archives of one state might be accidental; absence from all amounts to proof positive. In a similar way he is able to show that Rizzio was not a papal emissary.

The documents further enable Father Pollen to unravel the mystery attending the dispensation for the Darnley marriage. The wedding occurred July 29; the dispensation was not granted until some time between August 14 and September 25. On the 22nd of July, however, the day when the banns were published, Mary had received from the Pope a communication which the papal nuncio at Paris, one of its forwarders, believed to be the dispensation itself. Circumstances were pressing, Mary acted as if the dispensation had been granted—rumors were rife that it had been and Mary may have believed them—married Darnley and said nothing. Labanoff erroneously asserts that Mary's envoy, the bishop of Dunblane, arrived at Edinburgh with the dispensation on the 22nd of July and the banns were at once published. Recent historians have followed Labanoff.

Father Pollen rightly considers that the letters of Laureo, bishop of Mondovì, a nuncio despatched from Rome in June, 1566, form the most valuable body of documents in the entire collection. They prove the energy and determination with which Pius V. sought to regain the obedience of Scotland; they show also Mary's coolness in the cause, and the consistency with which she carried out her policy of compromise. The account which they give of the great tragedy of the reign is the fullest we possess, considering their early date. Two new details are of considerable importance. The first is a definite statement that "one rib in the King's body was found broken by the 'jump' of the fall, and all the inward parts crushed and bruised." The second is a circumstantial account of a simultaneous attack on Darnley in Edinburgh and Lennox in Glasgow. If this be true, it tends, as Father Pollen suggests, to redeem Mary from the charge of active participation in the murder on the score of her bringing Darnley from comparative safety at Glasgow to certain danger at Edinburgh. Finally, Laureo's letters prove that un-

sparing condemnation was meted out to Mary by papal emissaries and the Pope himself on account of her marriage with Bothwell. Negotiations were discontinued for two years.

It is with great interest that we await Father Pollen's critical edition of the Lennox papers and documents relating to the proposed excommunication of Elizabeth at Trent.

O. H. RICHARDSON.

The True Story of Captain John Smith. By KATHERINE PEARSON WOODS. (New York: Doubleday, Page and Co. 1902. Pp. xv, 382.)

THERE is welcome awaiting the book that shall tell Smith's story effectively or test his trustworthiness critically. Probably one volume cannot do both things; certainly the present volume does neither. The plan of the narrative is well conceived: one hundred and twenty pages suffice for all possible detail before and after the Virginian voyage, two brief chapters give the historical setting for the Jamestown expedition and over half the volume is reserved for Smith's heroic two years as colonist and governor. Moreover, Miss Woods feels to the full the charm of the robust manhood and romantic adventure wherewith her hero's own accounts clothe him, and she believes implicitly in his honesty. Nevertheless the story element is ruined by the intrusion of superfluous and shallow judgments and by a thoroughly wretched and fatal style.

And while the book is unsatisfactory to the lover of a good story, it is positively irritating to the historical student. "Not the least important" object of the volume, according to the preface, is "to still once and for all those disturbing voices that have of late years been busy in aspersing his [Smith's] memory." As a chief means to the accomplishment of this modest purpose, Miss Woods reprints two old maps of southern Russia, and she hopes that "for the future" certain names therein "will convict of simple ignorance him who doubts that John Smith fought the Turks in the 'Land of Zarkam' or was carried a slave and prisoner into 'Tartaria'!" Miss Woods seems not to know Mr. Lewis L. Kropf's formidable demonstration that the whole Transylvanian story is a worthless romance. So long as the Pocahontas story was taken as the touchstone of Smith's character, we were compelled to judge mainly from Smith's own rather confusing evidence, and it was largely a matter of temperament whether one believed him the soul of honor or a more or less artistic liar. But the Turks' heads and the coat of arms, it seems, may be tested by other than subjective standards. Mr. Kropf's articles in the *London Notes and Queries* of 1890 have taken the Transylvanian episodes out of the field of psychology into that of history, and Miss Woods's two maps go very little way toward silencing this disturbing voice.

The book teems with minor faults. In a work that claims historical character, it is not reassuring to come upon such uncalled for surmises as that Smith's Tartar lady Charatza "may very possibly have been even

[a Greek] Chryseis" (p. 69); or that Miss Mary Johnston's hero in *To Have and to Hold* is probably modeled after Smith (p. 216); or the more alarming assumption, that if Smith, instead of Rolfe, had married Pocahontas, a half-breed race to-day would dwell upon the Atlantic coasts of North America (p. 182). Statements that England derived her theory of divine right from Spain (p. 91), that under the charter of 1609 the governor in Virginia was appointed for life (p. 319) that when the Pilgrims planned their voyage, they intended to settle within the limits of the Plymouth Council (p. 357) do not inspire confidence in the author's historical preparation. One fails to understand why Newport should have been so disturbed by the death of one or more of his colonists each day just before his return to England (p. 146) if they were all to be alive again, to the full original number of a hundred and five, a few days later (p. 148). Page 103 makes Marco Polo's uncles his brothers and contains two sad misprints, the superfluous comma between the two parts of the name Francesco Pegolotti and the date 1468 instead of 1486 for Dias's voyage round the Cape. The method of giving references is slovenly, and the principle upon which they have been selected is not discernible.

W. M. WEST.

King Monmouth: A History of the Career of James Scott, "The Protestant Duke." 1649-1685. By ALLAN FEA. (London and New York: John Lane. 1902. Pp. xxix, 399.)

THE reason for the appearance of this life of Monmouth seems to be that the author has had new material at his disposal. Perhaps the most important part of this material is the Drayton Manuscripts, extracts from which have been printed in Part III. of the 9th Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. These manuscripts give much additional information on the movements of the royal forces during the rising of 1685. Mr. Fea considers three letters of the Duke very important, because they demonstrate the weakness of his character; he also thinks of equal importance the declaration made by Monmouth while a prisoner in the Tower that the title of king had been forced upon him and that Charles II. was not married to Lucy Walter. From a Dorchester manuscript dealing with the "Bloody Assize" it appears that the county of Devon which Macaulay says was "barely grazed" by the civil war was really very seriously involved. The available material in the State Papers Series and the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission have been fully utilized.

The particular service which Mr. Fea has performed has been to point out more clearly than has ever been done before that the weakest part of the Monmouth movement was Monmouth himself. "Ashley and his allies so encompassed him in their toils, that before he had reached the years when he might have been able to look clearly ahead for himself, he had become enslaved, a helpless tool of party faction." Shaftesbury put him forward as the commander of the forces sent to Scotland to quell the rising of the covenanters in 1679; at Shaftesbury's suggestion he

returned from exile in Holland in the autumn of the same year, and the same man sent him on the quasi-royal progress in the west in 1680. The author does not believe, however, that Monmouth was inveigled into the part he played in the rising. It is true that in his reply to Argyll's secretary he says that he does not desire to re-enter the world as a public character, but the sixteen lines in cipher which have apparently been overlooked by other writers "very possibly may have had an entirely different meaning; and this seems the more likely when we consider how readily he was soon afterwards induced to accept an invitation to Rotterdam, and whatever scruples he may have had were easily overcome by a personal interview." It has been supposed that the Prince of Orange was free from any complicity in the design, Macaulay even praising him for his attempt to prevent the departure of the expedition. Mr. Fea maintains, on the contrary, that "there was a deep rooted suspicion that he abetted the fatal enterprise with the view of getting rid of a popular and dangerous rival. Whatever arguments may be brought forward in opposition to this, it is wholly inconceivable that he was entirely ignorant of the plans of both Argyll and Monmouth, and a shrewd politician such as he can not have seen aught but failure before them in their undertaking." The Prince sent Monmouth on his way and then hastened to acquaint James of his departure. Monmouth's weakness appears at its worst after his arrival at Lyme—the most critical time in his life. Ample material for a formidable rising was at hand, troops from the country poured in, the militia came over in large numbers, and a rising in London only depended upon the presence of a leader. An eminent authority on war, Lord Wolseley, has expressed the opinion that the Duke's only chance for success was to seize Exeter at once where he would have secured money, arms and ammunition and then to hasten to Bristol which was willing to rise. But from the first, Monmouth's inertia made success impossible. He dallied four days at Lyme, and so dilatory were his actions that when he reached Taunton the Royalists were present in overwhelming numbers.

The volume is written in a very pleasing style, and has been made more attractive by the reproduction of portraits of Monmouth, Shaftesbury, Argyll and others. There are also many illustrations. The historical part, however, is sketchy, and Mr. Fea is in error in stating that Algernon Sidney was an officer in the Protector's army in 1648. Such a word as Sedgemoor might be included in the index.

HENRY LAWRENCE SCHOOLCRAFT.

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and the West Indies, 1689-1692. Edited by the Hon. J. W. FORTESCUE. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1901. Pp. xxxvi, 807.)

THIS volume contains a chronological descriptive catalogue of all such colonial papers of the above dates as are preserved in the Public Record Office in London and therein may be read the thread of the story of the "late happy revolution" as it affected the British possessions across the

sea. The news that the Prince of Orange had landed at Torbay was slow in reaching the American colonies, but when known, produced important results, especially in New England and New York.

Much of this material has long been available to us in Brodhead's *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of New York*, Vols. III. and IV. Last summer Mr. Lecky referred to that as a splendid piece of work and said that he wished similar collections had been made for other series of historical documents. But, valuable as is that collection and judicious as the editor was in his selections, it still remains *selected*. This calendar, however, adds to its value as it supplies links and further furnishes a complete list of all the papers stored in the London records with a clue to their contents. The papers themselves have been at the service of anyone who could go to the Record Office in Fetter Lane where every facility is afforded for investigation, with the minimum of red tape and the maximum of courtesy to be found everywhere. But in October it was still necessary for anyone seeking information of the communications from the colonies in the period covered by this new calendar, to search through various unindexed volumes—America and the West Indies, Board of Trade, Colonial Papers, and Colonial Entry Books. The old references given by Brodhead no longer applied and there was no principle whatsoever underlying the arrangement of the papers themselves in the manuscript volumes. Documents of precisely the same nature are found in different series, and duplicates are under different headings with no ostensible reason why. Thus—as indeed is true of all these calendars to state papers—an orderly chronological index is of inestimable value, especially if time be limited. It is now easy to select the originals desired before actually beginning work.

At first sight this calendar, edited by Hon. I. W. Fortescue, appears to be a splendid and perfect piece of work. The directions given by the Master of the Rolls are explicit. The editors are to make their calendars not only useful to those who may use them as indices to the originals, but the summaries are to be sufficiently full so that distant students are enabled to obtain knowledge of the contents of unvisited archives. In one sense this object has been admirably attained. The key moves very easily in the lock.

But with all due acknowledgment of the fine work done by Mr. Fortescue, and no one would deny its value, it must be confessed that a careful examination of the result leads to some disappointment. Article 10 in the list of instructions runs: "Where documents have been printed, a reference should be given to the publication." Now this rule has been observed in regard to Brodhead, to which reference is made under "New York Documents." There are occasional omissions (as orders in council no. 17, p. 6 and no. 102, p. 34, both being printed N. Y. Doc. III., 572, 573), but when twenty-seven hundred and eighty-nine documents have been dealt with that is not surprising nor are the occasional slips sufficient to affect the fundamental excellence of the work. But it is to be regretted that no mention is made of O'Callaghan's *Documentary*

History, Vol. II., or of the *Collections of the New York Historical Society*, 1868, both of which contain many of the papers in their entirety. It is quite possible, moreover, that others may be printed in local publications of Massachusetts, Maryland, etc., though that is another story. Here only New York matter is considered. In that field it is safe to say that it would have been a great advantage had the above volumes been referred to.

Further, there seems rather more bias both in the thirty-six pages of introduction wherein an outline of events in the colonies is given and in the summaries, than would appear quite justifiable in a publication which should rank as material for history rather than the dictum of an historian who has all the data before him. And it must be remembered that this is but part of the material and much that bears on the events here treated is to be found in America. As an example of the style, take, for instance, this sentence: "Though Boston was a city of Saints and one of Andros's accusers, Mather, was a minister of the Gospel, it seems that no one of them had ever heard of the ninth commandment" (p. xxi). Again, in turning from the New England portion of the narrative, Mr. Fortescue says: "The story of the Revolution [1688-89], *though from the nature of the case unclear*, [the italics are mine] is highly instructive and throws a vivid light on the subsequent revolution of 1774, at which time an account of it not including many of the facts herein set forth was published for the popular guidance."

The course of events in the colony of New York before Governor Sloughter, the duly accredited representative of William and Mary, reached Manhattan Island, is sketched with a spirit worthy a partizan of the anti-Leisler faction. No consideration is given to the weight of the Dutch peasant element in the little city which had finally relinquished allegiance to the States-General only fourteen years before the Protestant Dutch William crossed the channel to replace the Catholic James. It was not an educated nor very wise element, but it is quite possible that it was more honest in its convictions than Mr. Fortescue represents. The lieutenant governor and higher city officials were slow to act when the first news of the revolution in England reached them. They feared it "might be a Monmouth work" as the memory of that tragedy was still fresh in their minds. The overthrow of the said officials and the seizure of the government of New York by Jacob Leisler is, however, open to a different interpretation than that of pure ruffianism given by Mr. Fortescue. Leisler was not a "Walloon" (p. xvi) but a German who had entered the service of the West India Company and had passed twenty-nine of his fifty years as a merchant in New Amsterdam and New York, had married into a worthy Dutch family and was a fervent if uneducated and somewhat bigotted member of the Dutch Church with tremendous anti-Catholic convictions.

In the summary of the letter from William III. to Lieutenant-Governor Nicholson, No. 307, there is no mention of the second part of the address "and in his absence to such as for the time being take care for

Preserving the Peace and administering the Laws in said Province of New York in America." Now upon this phrase hung the law which Leisler claimed to follow when he assumed the title of governor. Nicholson was absent and Leisler was certainly *de facto* at the head of affairs. Thus, as rights go when an old order changes, there was some show of justification for his course, a show wholly ignored in the narrative suggested rather than related by Mr. Fortescue. And this suggestion of illegal violence extends to the index, where, under the heading "Jacob Leisler, *his continuance in crime*," is a reference to a simple order forbidding the defacement of proclamations.

Again, in referring (p. xvii) to Leisler's despatches to the home government, Mr. Fortescue says: "He [Leisler] had already been cunning enough to send home an emissary, Joost Stoll, to give his version of affairs at Whitehall, and now he supplemented this by further lying letters addressed to Bishop Burnet, whom for some reason he selected as the recipient of his wild and illiterate despatches." Now the act of stating the reasons for one's line of action is not in itself a heinous one and here too the adjectives seem open to criticism, considering the place where they appear.

Mr. Fortescue concludes his preface with an expression of regret that Macaulay should have treated the revolution of 1688 with so little reference to its effect on the British beyond the sea. Well here is a splendid series of hand-posts to show the way to treat that phase of the period. Only the writer should be familiar with his colonial archives as well as with what he can find at the Record Office before he is quite fixed in his conclusions.

RUTH PUTNAM.

The Queen's Comrade. The Life and Times of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough. By FITZGERALD MOLLOY. In two volumes. (London: Hutchinson and Co.; New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. 1901. Pp. ix, vii, 658.)

WHEN Mr. Froude published his *History of England*, he assured the carping critics that he could produce contemporary authority for all the conclusions which he had reached. Those who, for instance, doubted Henry VIII.'s magnanimity need only turn to the preambles of his Acts of Parliament, where they would find his motives fully set forth, and what more authentic evidence could they desire? The conclusions of Mr. Fitzgerald Molloy are based upon similar evidence. He is writing of a period when party feeling ran high; he finds strong statements made and, on the basis of such evidence, he depicts the characters in his volumes. Like Mr. Froude, he can say that there is contemporary authority for at least most of what he says, but the one thing wanting in both cases is discrimination. The book is written in the spirit of the Jacobite pamphleteers of the days of William III. Ostensibly it is a life of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, but it is also, in Mr. Molloy's own words, an attempt "to paint a vivid panorama of the stirring times in which she lived," and, in truth, the Duchess is often far in the background. Mr.

Molloy is on the lookout for picturesque features of social life, for the doings of eccentric people, and especially for gossip concerning the chief characters on his stage. He makes no attempt to describe or to estimate political forces. We have much about the villainy of William III.: we have little about the real problems with which William and his contemporaries were occupied. The volume is in truth not history but a re-statement for the twentieth century of the most piquant things to be found in the memoirs of the time. There is but slight evidence of research; Dalrymple and the Duchess herself are the chief authorities cited. Concerning the Duchess's own career nothing new is told us.

Posterity owes a certain grudge to Macaulay because his commonplace mind could appreciate only what was very black or very white in character delineation. He has made James II. an unmitigated villain and William III. an almost blameless hero. Ranke was the first to do justice, on an adequate basis of research, to James II.'s character, and his description of the later years of that unfortunate King corrects many of the impressions derived from Macaulay. Mr. Molloy praises James too, but without the discrimination of Ranke. In order to make James's situation in 1689 more pathetic, he describes the "aged" King deserted by his family (p. 96): James was at the time fifty-six years old. William on the other hand is full of almost prophetic wickedness (p. 130); he is "Mary's villainous little husband" (p. 134); he is fond of drink, and indulges in orgies where gin and doubtful jokes abound (p. 137); his amours are innumerable (p. 134). Mary, William's saintly wife, is, it is hinted, an adulteress (p. 136); she composes prayers to glorify not God but herself (p. 141), and shows to her sister Anne cruelty, deliberate and studied. Compton, Bishop of London, is a "blood-thirsty" prelate (p. 111) and a coward (p. 106); and so on. For most of this some verbal evidence could be found and yet Mr. Molloy's delineation is an almost grotesque perversion of truth. William was no saint, but he was at least an earnest statesman, and his conduct, while blameworthy, was still under restraint. Mary, we know, deplored and was troubled to the end, by the quarrel with Anne. Its main cause was that Anne was in communication with James II. who aimed to overthrow Mary's husband. Mr. Molloy makes much of the refusal to let Anne see Mary on her death-bed. Mary, however, was suffering from smallpox and the doctors expressly forbade Anne's visit.

The sensational head-lines, the thick paper, which makes some 650 pages into two portly volumes, the careless English, and, indeed, the author's avowed intention, point to a book made to sell, rather than to a serious study of the age of "the Queen's Comrade." The work is interesting and that, possibly, is the highest praise that the author desires.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles, D.D., LL.D., President of Yale College. Edited under the Authority of Yale College by FRANKLIN BOWDITCH DEXTER, M.A. In three volumes. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. 665; 573; 648).

EZRA STILES, son of the Rev. Isaac Stiles, of the parish of North Haven, New Haven, Connecticut, was born there on November 29, 1727. He was graduated at Yale in 1746, and after an attack of something like rationalism¹ was licensed to preach in 1749, when he presently became a tutor at Yale. In 1755 he accepted a call to the Second Congregational Church of Newport, Rhode Island. Here he remained, librarian of the Redwood Library as well, until in 1775 his church was temporarily broken up by the Revolution. After a sojourn at Dighton, he went in 1777 to occupy the pulpit at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, made vacant by the election of Samuel Langdon to the presidency of Harvard College. In 1778, though unanimously called to settle permanently at Portsmouth, he decided, after prolonged consideration, to accept the presidency of Yale, which he held until his death in 1795.

By his will he bequeathed his manuscripts for ten years to his son-in-law, the Rev. Abiel Holmes, of Cambridge, Massachusetts. In 1798 Holmes accordingly published a *Life of President Stiles*, which would seem remarkably lifeless were it not exceeded in dullness by Dr. Kingsley's abridgment of it, contributed in 1845, to Sparks's *Library of American Biography*.² Since that time, the good president has slept in peace; and his manuscripts, after their ten years' custody by Holmes, have reposed, according to the testator's direction, in the Yale library.

Among these manuscripts the most copious was what he called his *Literary Diary*. This included, together with almost daily records of fact and opinion, such copious citations from his voluminous reading that, for one thing, his extracts from Bruce's *Travels* extended to more than one hundred and twenty-five closely written pages (III. 448 m.). The portions of this *Literary Diary* which are of historical interest were selected by the Yale corporation as their official publication to celebrate the bicentennial anniversary of the college, in October, 1901. Mr. Dexter, the editor of this publication, has done his work with compact precision; for comprehensive brevity his notes are admirable, and, except analytically, so is his index. In consequence, we have at last a picture of New England life from 1769 to 1795 as faithful and as detailed as Sewall's memoranda of life in Massachusetts, which closed forty years before.

Not that Stiles was a second Sewall. The learned president possessed neither humor nor such artless lack of it as should make his records entertaining. In all three volumes the only memorable phrase is his reflection when doubtful whether to relinquish Portsmouth for Yale: "An hundred and fifty or 180 Young Gentlemen Students, is a Bundle of Wild Fire not

¹ Abiel Holmes, *Life of Ezra Stiles* (Boston: Thomas and Andrews, 1798), pp. 35 ff.

² Second Series, VI., 3-79.

easily controlled & governed—and at best the Diadem of a President is a Crown of Thorns" (II. 209). But in his own dry, accurate way, he was an excellent scientific observer, as well as a noteworthy linguist, historian and theologian; he jotted down from day to day, and from year to year, such solid statements of fact as make his pages inexhaustible. You find in them not only the daily life of New England, with innumerable sketches of character, but all manner of side-lights on history itself,—on the progress of Revolutionary feeling, for example; on the news and the details of the war, often illustrated by sketches of the battle-fields;—and on the growth of the Constitution. Into all this there is no space to enter here. A single phase of the book must serve to illustrate its character and its value.

Among the salient traits of Dr. Stiles was an American patriotism which often makes him seem rather like a traditional Fourth of July orator than like what he was—an eminent private citizen of the period which Fourth of July orations traditionally glorify. The temper, for example, of the political comments he wrote on February 18th, 1773 (I. 343-345) is precisely like that which animates our patriotic eloquence from 1800 to 1850. A gentleman and a scholar, an unbending pillar of the traditional clerical aristocracy of New England, he nevertheless hated England and adored independence as blindly as if he had learned our history in public schools which hold patriotic fervor the sole end of historical study; and though never democratic, his principles were strongly republican. The personal note here is so strong that one instinctively seeks personal causes for it; nothing could more instructively illustrate the origin of our most potent national prejudice.

Two distinct causes for it presently transpire. The first animates, among many other passages, his virulent comment on Cadwallader Colden (II. 77-78), "an old Sinner . . ." who "had a superlative Contempt for American Learning." Now Stiles was an extraordinarily learned man, in that happy period when learning was not so highly specialized as to preclude comprehensiveness; but the circumstances of American life had compelled him to be mostly self-taught. For example, with the aid of learned Jews at Newport, he mastered several Oriental languages after he was forty years old;¹ and he was equally interested, all his life, in questions of science, of archæology, of whatever should excite his insatiable scholarly curiosity. He wrote, accordingly, voluminous inquiries to learned people abroad. The fate of these, many of which are mentioned in the Diary, is thus recorded by Holmes:² "Whether these letters, or their answers miscarried; or, whether the persons addressed were not sufficiently inquisitive, or had not leisure, or abilities, to make the desired researches; or to whatever cause it is to be ascribed; no replies have been discovered." Stiles, in short, was a self-made scholar, in a region which long after his time Campbell's *Life of Lord Lyndhurst* dismissed as the "deserts and trading villages" of America. The aca-

¹ Holmes, *Life*, 128, ff.; *Cl. Lit. Diary*, I. 500.

² Preface, v.

demic scholars of England treated epistles from such a source as waste paper; and, with all the sensitiveness of a self-made man, he resented their insolence even beyond its deserts. Had England had better manners, America would have had fewer patriots.

The second cause of Stiles's Americanism lay deeper. Though of remarkable sectarian independence for his time, he bitterly hated Episcopalians (*e. g.* II. 113-115). One can soon see why. Mr. Dexter's index has failed to specify just where Stiles's comment on the term "Dissenters" occurs; but it is to the effect that Congregationalists, though dissenters in England, are not so in America, but that there the true dissenters are Episcopalians. As an Orthodox Congregational minister, in short, he held himself a member of an apostolically ordained¹ ecclesiastical establishment for which he confidently predicted hemispheric primacy (I. 345). The clergy of this hierarchy, no matter how small their charges, he habitually designated by the names of their churches (*e. g.* I. 127) until one insensibly begins to feel that in New England the preposition *of* was very like a particle of nobility. In church councils every reverend pastor ought to have an equal voice, whence Stiles's republicanism; and no layman ought to have voice equal to theirs,² whence his freedom from democracy. Now, in his opinion, confirmed by the traditions of emigrant Puritanism, the Church of England, and all episcopacy, threatened the security of the American establishment. His most remarkable assertion of these principles occurred in September, 1785, when he was moderator of the council which ordained his son-in-law, Abiel Holmes (III. 188). At that time Samuel Seabury, lately consecrated in Scotland, had returned to Connecticut; but as yet there was no other American bishop. To assert the full dignity of American Congregationalism, Stiles "addressed the Candidate in the following written words: 'In the name of our L^d J. C. and by Authority derived from him the great Head of the Chh, We as Ministers of the Gospel, do separate thee, Abiel Holmes, to the Work of the Ministry, and by Prayer & the Laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, do consecrate and ordain thee a Bishop in the Church of God.'" On the following day Bishop Seabury ordained certain Episcopal clergymen in that same city of New Haven (III. 189). But Stiles was still ahead of him. In the name of New England Orthodoxy he had already used in ordination that obnoxious word bishop; and Seabury could not canonically so use it until he had two fellow bishops to help him. From beginning to end, Stiles was faithful to the aristocratic but republican principles of the New England churches. And so he hated the intruding dissent of Episcopal England; and thus he came again, more deeply than from mere wounded vanity, to hate England itself.

This brief indication of how a Yankee parson, with all his conservatism, learning and love of authority, became, well before the Revolution, as American as Andrew Jackson, is merely one example, and very

¹ See his punctilious derivation of his orders. I. 126-127.

² See in general his views concerning the corporation of Yale. III. 452-456.

likely not the most important, of what even cursory study must surely find beneath the dull and heavy surface of the *Literary Diary*. The debt of American scholarship to Yale is incalculable; and no single item of it promises more lasting value than this official monument of the bicentennial anniversary.

BARRETT WENDELL.

A Short History of the American Revolution. By EVERETT TOMLINSON. (New York: Doubleday, Page and Co. 1901. Pp. x, 419.)

THIS book fulfils the promise of its preface to give the reader considerable information, not commonly possessed, regarding the part taken by the "common people" in their homes as well as in the army during the war of the American Revolution. Its incidents are particularly illustrative of the feelings of the combatants and non-combatants, and tend to prove that the nation and the armies from which our independence was won were even less just and humane than they have been represented. The work will not find favor among those who deprecate reviving or fostering the animosities of the Revolutionary War. It was manifestly not conceived or executed in a spirit of historical fairness and accuracy. Gates and Charles Lee are criticized with more than usual acrimony and injustice. The author seems to have forgotten himself or to ignore the import of his language when he says (p. 163) that Howe after a trial "abandoned Lee's suggestions, and followed his own plans, with greater success than otherwise he could have gained." The great British cavalry leader is stigmatized as the "infamous Tarleton."

There are few references to authorities. That there was more humanity on the side of the Americans than on that of the British may be regarded as proved by the concurrent testimony of historians in general, but that the disparity was as great as it appears in this work no fair-minded reader will believe on its uncorroborated testimony. It is little short of incredible that the Whigs or Patriots should have had any great advantage in point of humanity over their former fellow countrymen who were Tories. But the author would have us believe that they had. Having told how at Arnold's attack on New London, Colonel Ledyard and 70 of his men were killed and 35 terribly wounded after they had surrendered, he goes on to state:

"Not satisfied even with the murders they had committed, the vile Tories and Hessians took some of the wounded prisoners, and placing them in a cart at the brow of the hill, gave the cart a push, and sent it head long down the steep side toward the river! Above the noise of the conflagration—for the little place was set on fire—rose the cries of the suffering men. Not even a drink of water was given them. Such brutality, such inhuman cruelty, was not exceeded elsewhere, and it was due to the intense hatred which the Tories had come to have for their former friends and comrades."

The style as well as the matter of the work would indicate that it was addressed especially to young people. But an old head would be puzzled

at the first reading of some of its involved and obscure sentences, for instance, the following :

"General Gates, who at the time was in command of the Northern army, having superseded Schuyler in that office, although Washington well knew that Philip Schuyler was much the better man, in spite of the petty jealousies and rivalries of the colonies that prevented him from following his own better judgment, had called a council " etc.

Among its special features are a number of extracts from contemporary poems bordering more or less closely on doggerel, from contemporary newspapers, letters, diaries, etc., and illustrations from paintings by Chappel and Wageman. The latter are distributed through the book without regard to the text. They are mostly battle scenes, and like most such pictures fail to convey even a faint general idea of the battles. There is not a map or plan in the book.

JOHN BIGELOW, JR.

Letters of James Murray, Loyalist. Edited by NINA MOORE TIFFANY, assisted by SUSAN I. LESLEY. (Printed, not published, Boston : For sale by W. B. Clarke Co. 1901. Pp. v, 324.)

THIS well-edited book which, first of all, is of interest to the descendants of James Murray, has a real value for the student of colonial history and the Revolution. Beginning with a rapid review of the ancestral Murrays who dwelt upon the Scottish border, and evolving from a half-legendary Murray of "gigantic stature" the more human James Murray, who, "porridge-fed" and "bare-legged," passed his boyhood in Scotland, the editor lets the hero's letters tell the tale from the early days of apprenticeship to a London merchant. Within a few years James Murray became interested in the American colony of North Carolina and went there in 1735 to become a pioneer planter. His letters tell of the colonial life, from the suggestive hint that wigs lasted there a long while, to the confession that he expected to pay a goodly bribe to get a position as collector of the port. Many details of the ordinary business of a merchant and the customs of the colonists in business matters abound, showing the kind of goods that were desired and the products most profitable for exportation. Mr. Murray was incensed over the persistence with which people tried to manufacture, instead of giving all their attention to agriculture and purchasing their manufactured goods from England. He also railed against the paper money mania. Finally being drawn into politics as a member of the governor's board of councillors, the new calling led him to write about the efforts to collect the "quit rents" and about the conflicts within the council. His loyalist tendencies crop out very early in a statement that the disputes of the province are not between the people in general and the governor, for they get along very well, but "there are a certain set of Men in the Province who are never to be Satisfied if they have not the Chief Management of Affairs." There is much evidence that James Murray never became a true *American*, as was the case with over two-thirds of those men who became prominent as opponents of the American Revolution.

Before the earliest signs of the coming storm were seen in America, James Murray left North Carolina for Boston, where his lot fell among the aristocrats, and this fact plainly determined the party he would later choose. The letters, not limited to those of James Murray alone, are those of a Tory group and, as early as 1769, are filled with indignation that "those daring Sons of Liberty are now at the tip-top of their Power and . . . even to Speak disrespectfully of the Well Disposed is a Crime equal to high Treason." In the following year the "factious spirit" is at great height and cannot rise much higher "without the poor People, many of whom are almost starving for want of Employment, going to plunder the Rich and then cutting their throats." A year later he wrote that Ruggles and other Loyalists had got "handsome places" for being "friends of Government," and his wife urged that he, who had no less signalized himself on that side, should try his "luck."

That he was not blind to the future of America is evident in his statement that "in the process of time this extensive fertile territory, cultivated as it will be by millions of people, healthy and strong, must by nature of things predominate" over England. Realizing this, and that a proposed union of the colonies was "a step in the scheme of Providence for fixing in time an empire in America," he yet failed to comprehend how near that empire was to its birth.

James Murray considered the Stamp Act far from being harmful to the colonies, but rather a necessary spur to their industries. If he had said such things to "our Chief Ruler, the Mob," he would have had his "house turned inside out." He complained bitterly that America's worst disease was "the Power of the People, who blindly devolve it on an artful Demagogue." He was not long in being marked as a "King's man," especially when he opened his sugar house to Gage's men and showed a free hospitality to the British officers. Mr. Murray and other Tories finally making up their minds that England was a more congenial country than America, went to the mother country, where they wrote one another consolatory letters about the rebellious province of Massachusetts. From home they learned of the growing power of the mob and the outrages suffered by Tories, how their coaches were burned and pulled in pieces, their loads of goods attacked and destroyed or stolen, their effigies burned. No Tory could sleep until the firearms were loaded and the lights properly placed in the house. One wrote that on her estate, "every beauty of art or nature, every elegance which it cost years of care and toil in bringing to perfection, is laid low."

In the remainder of the book much information is to be found on the treatment of the Tories during the early stages of the Revolution. In the final chapter, the days of exile are described and the last days of Mr. Murray, who died in 1781 before the war had closed. An appendix contains a genealogy of the Murrays and other data about individual members of the family.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

Nathan Hale, 1776; Biography and Memorials. By HENRY PHELPS JOHNSTON. (New York: Privately Printed. 1901. Pp. xii, 208.)

MECHANICALLY this octavo volume is a good example of book-making; its 22 plates are by the Bierstadt artotype process, and the printing was done by the DeVinne Press. The edition is limited to four hundred copies on hand-made paper, and 25 copies on Japan paper. The text occupies 130 pages, and an "Appendix," pp. 131-205, consists of some of Hale's correspondence, his army diary, tributes, memorials and notes.

In seven chapters Professor Johnston recounts Hale's ancestry, home-life, college career at Yale, profession of school-master, identification with the American Revolution, and his untimely fate and execution as a spy. The work is not always well-balanced. An apparent dearth of data appears, where ample materials exist for more elaborate treatment. Fortunately the author has avoided repeating numerous fictions which have passed for facts for many years, but he has also encountered his own stumbling-blocks. Mr. George E. Hoadley (p. vi) does not possess any of Stuart's manuscripts. The Hale house (p. 15) was not built until after the martyr's death, and could not, therefore, have been "familiar" to him. The Fordyce volume (p. 38) very likely belonged to another Nathan Hale, and Van Mastricht's treatise was not secured by Mr. Havemeyer at the Brinley sale, but came into his possession many years afterward. On p. 135 Hale's letter (no. 2) is dated "Sept.," but should be "Aug^m"—as Stuart's correspondence of 1848 shows. The date of transfer of the school-house at East Haddam (p. 196) took place in 1900, not 1890; and the note (p. 204) on "Hale Bibliography" is strikingly incomplete. But these are minor points.

Hale's letters and those of his correspondents are not printed with scientific accuracy, and of the latter quite a few of importance, which have been preserved, seem to be unknown to the author. This is also the case with regard to poetical and other effusions written by Hale, which are an index of his attainments and a commentary on his interests. The text of the camp diary is quite accurate—only a few misreadings having been discovered. The last entry in this diary is not the latest extant item written by Hale, as Professor Johnston supposes. It is lamentable that so few of Hale's own letters have survived; undoubtedly many were lost at the burning of New London on September 6, 1781. The chapter on Hale's ancestry is adequate, but his home-life and college career are susceptible of extensive treatment, and are in his case a *sine qua non* as related to the climax of his life. Hale's conduct in the army was a pleasant contrast to that of some of his own men, notably his lieutenant, Alpheus Chapman, who was found guilty by a court martial of "disobedience of orders and refusing his duty," for which he was dismissed from the Continental service on June 16, 1776.

Hale's love affair is mentioned with remarkable brevity. In a letter unknown to the author, a Wethersfield correspondent boldly jibes Hale

(June 7, 1774) for being "engaged [in] the amorous pursuit" and adds: "For tho' I would allow Miss Adams every charm which was in the power of Nature to bestow, or Art to polish," yet (as summarized) we have some equally fine girls in this town. He continues: "At Yale your Character was certainly that of a scholar and not of a Buck!" An undated love poem to Alicia Adams reveals Hale's heart:

"Far from the seat of pleasure now I roam,"

he wrote, yet professed

"My thoughts are settled on the friend I love."

How does Professor Johnston reconcile these facts with his account?

The author dismisses the story of betrayal by a Tory cousin, Samuel Hale of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, by saying that "Stuart himself demolished it, and we may reject it." The suspicion of betrayal is first recorded by Nathan's brother, Enoch, in his diary on October 15, 1776. It was often repeated in other places, subsequently. Living witnesses of the period, belonging to the family, as late as 1836 wrote that "freedom as well as delicacy will require a total silence on that subject. . . . And even if true they feel that at this late day it had better be left in oblivion if possible." Naturally this was an uncongenial topic. The accused endeavored to "square" himself against "that infamous newspaper publication charging me with *ingratitude*." Naturally; but on the other hand he was a troublesome Tory, and had been repeatedly confined. He joined the British in 1775, was Deputy Commissary of Prisoners at New York at the time of Nathan's capture, and remained with the British army until October, 1778.

Professor Johnston sets up a new claim as to the site of Hale's execution, namely at Turtle Bay or "approximately near the corner of Forty-fifth Street and First Avenue," New York. We believe his contention to be untenable and not established by facts. The British army entered New York at this point on September 15. General Robertson with a brigade took possession of the works in the city proper on the evening of that day, while the rest of the army encamped "with the right at Horen's Hook on East river, and the left at the North river near Blooming Dale," "in which positions," General Howe wrote on the 21st, they "still continue." A more inauspicious place could hardly be imagined than that which Professor Johnston suggests for Artillery Park, namely at Turtle Bay, when one considers the juncture of events, where the use of artillery was so imperative. The table land near the old five-mile stone, afterwards laid out as Hamilton Square, was the highest ground south of Harlem, with a commanding view to the north, and well-known as a place of review for the royal artillery before the war. On this plain "about a mile beyond Turtle Bay" the great artillery exercises took place. Captain John Montresor records such an event in his "Journal" under date of August 20, 1766, which is characteristic. This is the site, near Dove Tavern, which the late William Kelby, of the New York Historical Society, established as the place of Hale's execu-

tion. The late Dr. George H. Moore about thirty years ago secured data favoring this site, and we have discovered Hessian records which, while they do not contradict, speak much in favor of that view. It is regrettable that the brevity of the index (4 pp.) makes it almost useless as a guide to the persons, places and events mentioned in the volume.

William Pitt. Von FELIX SALOMON. Band I. Bis zum Ausgang der Friedensperiode, 1793. Teil I. Die Grundlagen. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1901. Pp. xiv, 208).

EVEN to an age which had seen Fox a member of Parliament at nineteen, the successful premiership of Pitt at twenty-five appeared a marvel. This work undertakes to solve the mystery. Without slighting in Pitt's genius and training the personal factors in the problem, the author departs from the traditional view by casting elsewhere the weight of his explanation. In Chatham, Dr. Salomon sees not merely the illustrious father of a still greater son. He was the founder of a political, as Adam Smith was of an economic, system which together formed the basis of Pitt's public career. The author accordingly after sketching, in the first chapter, the history of Pitt's family and youth to the death of Chatham, compares, in the second (pp. 39-111), the political doctrines of Chatham with those of Burke and of George III. Of these the last, a belated champion of royal absolutism, effected a puny revival of the old Tories; Burke, the versatile apologist of parliamentary absolutism and party government, became the regenerator of the old Whigs; while Chatham, who professed to be above party, founded in the end a new Toryism.

The germ of Chatham's political system was his theory of the laws. In his view, these were not, as was held by Burke, an arbitrary growth of rights based upon prescription. They were the masterpieces of the human reason, invested as such, in their constitutional forms, with an authority almost sacred. The Revolution of 1688 Chatham held to be not a mere defeat of the King nor victory of Parliament. It was a triumph of the law, and the puppetdom to which the Whigs, from a contrary belief, had depressed the throne under the first and second Georges, was a breach of the constitution. But the touchstone of his as of all political doctrine of the time lay beyond these domestic problems, in the American question. With respect to the colonies the King asserted both the right and the expediency of arbitrary taxation. Burke denied the expediency, but, true to his Whig partiality for parliamentary absolutism, he asserted the right. Chatham denied both. The King's American subjects, Chatham held, stood in the same relation to the constitution as did their British brethren: under it they could not be taxed arbitrarily, from it they could not withdraw. With Burke then, the resistance of the colonies was illegitimate but excusable; and once they had established a de facto independence, there was nothing in his theory of the law to justify an effort at reconquest. History had simply taken a turn which he was prepared to register. With Chatham, the resistance was legitimate, the secession was not. The constitution violated by the King and Par-

liament was still binding upon offender and offended, and for its maintenance in America Chatham would continue a struggle almost hopeless.

Thus does the author harmonize Chatham's attitudes at various stages of this conflict. The political consistency of that statesman indeed he vindicates throughout against the criticism of Macaulay and Lecky. Between Chatham's political and economic views he finds on the contrary a want of harmony. A reformer in the political, Chatham was, in the economic sphere, like his Whig opponents, a mercantilist. Burke, oddly enough yet not inconsistently, disagreed on this point with his party, and developed within it more liberal economic views. Pitt, being forced to look elsewhere than to Chatham for an economic mentor, found this in Adam Smith who, in a work unsystematic in itself, expanded the teachings of Child, Davenant, Tucker and Hume into the new economic system based, in its philosophy, on Locke, Shaftesbury, and Newton. A discussion at large of this system and of that which it displaced is, in connection with the contemporary social and economic development of England, the theme of the third, concluding chapter. It closes with this observation: while the old Tories, out of opposition to the Whig aristocracy, made the first attack upon the old economic system, the theory of the new was first perfected by Whigs of the Burke school, amongst whom is Smith; but those theories were applied in practice by none of these; they were the complement, on the economic side, of Chatham's political system, and as such were they adopted and applied by the new Toryism founded by Chatham and called to power, when the loss of America had humbled the King and tempered his ambition, in the person of Chatham's son.

Dr. Salomon is an investigator, of independent judgment, who, in the effort to exhaust all available material, has pursued even single letters in private hands. There is in his work depth of thought and brilliance of idea: there is also a want of clearness enhanced by a style difficult and diffuse. That he has at points wandered somewhat far afield, he himself seems not altogether unconscious. His manifest purpose is not merely to narrate the incidents of Pitt's life, but to illustrate, by a political biography the rôle of Pitt in English history. The measure of his success is still uncertain. To estimate it by the portion of the work before us would be to judge a mansion by its threshold.

H. M. BOWMAN.

The French Revolution and Religious Reform. An Account of Ecclesiastical Legislation and its Influence in Affairs in France from 1789 to 1804. By WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xxvii, 333.)

THE importance of the subject treated in this volume will be acknowledged by all students of the French Revolution. The Old Régime was so thoroughly ecclesiastical that it is a matter of some surprise that the fortunes of the French church should have so generally been treated as a secondary matter. Of late years this want has been remedied to a con-

siderable extent by French monographs, but Professor Sloane's work meets a want in the English literature dealing with the Revolution. We are, however, inclined to feel that he has obscured the real issue between ecclesiasticism and the party of "philosophy" when he says (p. ix) that "the mightiest obstructive force was ecclesiastical fanaticism both positive and negative"; for in order to justify this statement he is obliged to regard "the deism and the atheism of the 'philosophers' as religious forces for the purpose of our discussion." Fortunately, however, the confusion of definitions does not extend beyond the preface, and the book as a whole discusses the fortunes of the Ultramontane party and the non-juring priests under the various revolutionary governments.

Professor Sloane's sympathies are steadily with the church, even if not always with its representatives. Occasionally they lead him into rather turgid rhetoric if, indeed, not into an actual loss of historical impartiality. The burial of Voltaire marks a time when "the broad highway to blasphemy and scandal was thenceforth opened wide, and thousands thronged to enter it." After September, 1793, "the course of the sovereign assembly was a swift descent to hell, in which every type of extreme fanatic heathen took his turn at the helm and was swept into perdition to make room for another, until the engulfing maelstrom was reached and the faint hearted, shallow [lean and bilious, p. 199] Robespierre sounded the alarm" (p. 195).

Nor is Professor Sloane to be reckoned among those historians who attempt any serious appreciation of the Terrorists as political theorists or as administrators. The September Massacres he regards as (p. 190) "virtually legal," and "the pleas for the Convention so constantly reiterated" he holds to be "all alike pitiful—all except one: it was the incarnation of energy." The Convention was "revelling in political and religious massacre" and "gorging itself in the dismembered limbs of the social organism" (p. 196)—and this notwithstanding the statements of its accomplishments in page 225.

Yet if we are obliged to differ with the author's interpretation of the political side of the Revolution we cannot fail to appreciate his sympathy with the non-juring priests, his exposition of the motives and doings of ecclesiastical parties, and the nicety with which he estimates the actual influence of the church as an institution upon the course of events. Especially happy is his recognition of the complications arising from any dependence of the Church upon the State (p. 160) and his treatment of the indecision and insincerity shown by Louis XVI. in his treatment of the questions involved in the civil constitution of the clergy. Perhaps the most satisfactory treatment of the volume, however, is that accorded the Concordat. Whenever Professor Sloane touches upon Napoleon his treatment is firm and illuminating.

As a whole, despite a certain vagueness of arrangement, the volume is a serviceable addition to the literature of the Revolution. Less a narrative than a commentary upon facts assumed to be known, it brings

into truer perspective the potent ecclesiastical element in history which so many non-theological writers seem disposed to ignore.

SHAILER MATHEWS.

Robespierre: A Study. By HILAIRE BELLOC, B.A. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xiii, 387.)

FROM a literary point of view, Mr. Belloc has written a most attractive book. While not in sympathy with Robespierre, almost wishing, he tells us, when the work was done, "that instead of wandering in such a desert" it had been his task "to follow St. Just and the wars, and to revive the memories of forgotten valour," yet he has seized upon the essential traits of Robespierre's character and constructed a remarkably clear-cut portrait of the man. He has a keen sense for dramatic situations and knows how to make the most of them, not infrequently more than the evidence would seem to justify.

Artistically the work is a success; scientifically, I fear that it is not. Mr. Belloc realized "that such an attempt at vivid presentation carries with it a certain suspicion when it is applied to history," but added that the details that he had admitted could be "proved true from the witness of contemporaries or from the inference which their descriptions and the public records of the time permit one to draw" (p. xii). If this were really true, if all the details in the book rested on reliable evidence, the work would be as sound scientifically as it is attractive artistically. Unfortunately, it is not true. Mr. Belloc is more artist than historian. An exceedingly active subconscious imagination is not kept sufficiently under control. He takes the work of the historian too lightly, displaying a lack of patience and precision in the study of facts. That he "disclaims research," that he adds nothing to what Hamel has told us of the details of Robespierre's life, is in no wise discreditable, but none of these things justify inaccuracy. Mr. Belloc is inaccurate. I should hesitate to make use of any statement of fact contained in his book, before I had carefully verified it. Moreover, he either consciously states more than evidence permits, or he is unable to draw the line between fact and fiction. I shall cite but one example among many of the overstepping of the bounds between historical science and historical romance. After describing the origin of the Breton Club, Mr. Belloc writes: "This 'Brutus club' Robespierre of course joined. But he was not content with joining only. He was careful to be among its earliest arrivals, he was present at its least-attended meetings" (p. 81). Here are three affirmations; the first is a very questionable inference, the second and third pure fiction. (See Aulard, *La Société des Jacobins*, I., pp. ii-xviii.)

An excellent illustration of the inability of Mr. Belloc to handle evidence seriously is furnished by his treatment of the question of "Robespierre's Supposed Attempt at Suicide" (Appendix, note iii.). Compare his work with Aulard's treatment of the same subject (*Études et Leçons, Première Série*, pp. 282-300). Mr. Belloc evidently found his evidence in Aulard's study, but note how he has disfigured it in work-

ing it over. On a par with this is the citation of the list of members of the Jacobin Club printed in December 1790 to show the composition of that club in August 1792 (p. 194). A long list might be made of the inaccurate statements contained in the book. One of the most amusing is the assertion that Brissot "was childless and satisfied with power alone" (p. 167). When Brissot was guillotined in 1793, he left three children behind him! (*Mémoires de Brissot*, I. 15.)

Mr. Belloc's translations of Robespierre's speeches are very free, sometimes so free that they are not true to the original. The not infrequent assertion that he "will" believe this or that is devoid of meaning in a historical work; his flippant manner in calling Lafayette a "noodle" (p. 188) and some of his witnesses "liars" is not indicative of good taste, to say the least. Why call the National Assembly a "Parliament" when that term meant a high court of justice in the France of 1789? Finally, Mr. Belloc is not always careful in placing the French accents. Bo should be Bô; Réclus, Reclus. Throughout the book, he writes Herbert in place of Hébert.

The book suggests a psychological problem; is it impossible to combine scientific accuracy with a vivid imagination and unusual talent in the portrayal of character?

FRED MORROW FLING.

The Writings of James Monroe. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. V., 1807-1816. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901. Pp. xvii, 390.)

IN our review of Vol. IV. (*AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, VI. 596), the apprehension was expressed that the fulness with which Monroe's correspondence down to the end of 1806 had been printed would have to be compensated by disproportionate brevity in the more important period which was to follow. The present volume shows that this fear is beginning to be realized. Four of the ten years which it covers—1807, 1808, 1811 and 1814—were years of great consequence in the life of Monroe and in the history of his relations with the government of the United States. Yet the correspondence of these ten years at the Department of State is represented by a selection not much more than half as ample as that which was used to illustrate the years 1803-1806.

All but about twenty of the letters came from the source named. Of the remainder, the most interesting is the remarkable letter (pp. 53-63), reprinted from the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, of February, 1900, in which Monroe gives instructions and suggestions to a member of his Virginian "campaign committee" of 1808, and which shows, more satisfactorily than anything else which has hitherto come to light, the exact extent to which he then went in aspiration after the presidency. Few specimens of the public correspondence are given, whether with Canning in 1807 or with our ministers abroad and the envoys at Washington after Monroe became Secretary of State. An exception is the well-known letter of July 23, 1811, to Augustus J. Foster.

This is printed in an appendix. In this appendix appear a number of other letters which, so far as the present reviewer can see, might better have been inserted in their chronological order in the body of the volume. Another anomaly of the arrangement is that five letters of 1806 are given, where they would hardly be looked for, in the foot-notes to pp. 39-46. There is an almost entire lack of explanatory foot-notes. In a considerable number of instances, the "lower critic" suspects misreading of the manuscript; at least he perceives that, where the word used makes no sense, one which in handwriting looks like it would make the sentence rational.

But there is a great deal of excellent and interesting material in the volume; more perhaps than in any of those which have preceded. Monroe, now become one of the principal personages in the United States, writes better letters; and the transactions have not been so fully illustrated as his diplomatic career abroad has been, by documents in the *American State Papers*. Mr. Henry Adams, to be sure, has made extensive use of the Monroe MSS., and with his usual firm grasp has seized upon the most important letters. But he has printed only brief extracts. It is far more satisfactory to have the full texts. This is particularly evident when we try to follow the process by which Monroe, coming home at the end of 1807 with a very injured feeling about his rejected treaty, and put forward in 1808 as an opposition candidate against Madison, gradually becomes reconciled to the administration, and finally is persuaded to share the latter's fortunes. Placed in a difficult and delicate situation, he walked with firmness and self-confidence the narrow path which he marked out for himself. He felt that he had been ill used by the administration, and he dissented widely from its policy. On the other hand, as he well shows in long letters to Taylor and Tazewell, to lend himself to Randolph's schemes would only disorganize the party and help the Federalists. It is evident that, after five years spent in Europe, the simon-pure doctrines of 1798 had ceased to be Alpha and Omega to him. He had become a practical statesman, not separated by any generic difference from the Jefferson and Madison of 1808. He was readily persuaded that Jefferson had meant no harm to him personally; perhaps more readily than the facts warranted. The offer of a Barataria in Upper Louisiana, and the resignation of W. C. Nicholas a few days later, so timed that Monroe could not possibly succeed him in Congress (pp. 104, 109-113), have a disagreeable look when conjoined; "the hand of Joab is in this thing." Monroe was not without suspicions; but at fifty he was also not without patience, and he did not repeat, in anything like the same form, the experiment of a View of the Conduct of the Executive. By 1811 he had become indispensable, and he had done nothing to make himself impossible. But a man of acuter sensibilities would not have asked for another mission to France and England in January, 1809 (pp. 90, 93).

The letters of the year 1814 are distinctly under-represented in Mr. Hamilton's selection; but he has printed in his appendix Monroe's

narrative of his official conduct in connection with the invasion and capture of Washington.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

The Nineteenth Century: A Review of Progress. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901. Pp. x, 494.)

IT is sometimes not a bad thing for a review to be delayed, much as the publishers dislike it; it gives one a little more perspective. The present collection of seven and thirty papers, by many well-known names, on divers aspects of the century just ended, first appeared, I believe, in the columns of the *New York Evening Post*, in the opening days of 1901. It is one of the best of the numerous attempts of journalistic enterprise to secure a sort of co-operative stock-taking of nineteenth century "Progress." Much of the writing is so good that it was quite worth while to reprint it in book form; and the volume will continue to deserve for some time a place in the library. But it will perhaps be as interesting to future readers for the light it throws on the state of mind of people in the winter of 1900 as for the information it gives on the movements of the preceding hundred years; and even thus early there are some things the authors would not put down if they had to write now. Even Mr. Sedgwick would hardly observe to-day that "the land question in Ireland has been disposed of" (p. 39).

To criticise adequately each of the articles in this volume would demand encyclopædic knowledge and unlimited space. All that can be done is to notice some characteristics of the collection as a whole, and to refer to a few of the articles of especial interest.

Perhaps it would be unfair to comment with any severity upon the omissions. The writers were necessarily a scratch team; and many a good article must have been lost to the rival importunities of other journals. Still the present collection is extravagantly lop-sided. Religion, for instance, is only represented by a paper of Mr. Leslie Stephen's on "Evolution and Religious Conceptions," in the section headed "Education and Science"; and the reference to Biblical criticism occupies just three lines. There is not a single article on United States history; and he would be a very careful reader who managed to discover from the volume that there had been a great civil war in that country. Russia and Germany have articles to themselves; but France and Austria-Hungary and Italy are omitted from the survey. China and Japan are slightly touched upon; India is disregarded. Mexico occasions an appropriate rhapsody, and Canada's merits are presented by Sir John Bourinot; but Australasia and South America might have no existence for all the reader would gather to the contrary. The side of political history is one on which the volume is conspicuously weak in quality as well as in quantity. It is hard to find any excuse for a writer who can assert that in England "the crown has remained in control of foreign affairs" (p. 41); one can only recommend a course of the *Daily Mail*. And the courage of that other writer who can discourse upon "The Immutability of the

American Constitution," in the year of grace 1900, calls for surprise and not imitation.

If political history is weak, economic history is in even worse case. There is an *omnium gatherum* of geographical conquests, gold standard, steel manufacture, libraries, life assurance, and the status of woman, under the section-heading "Sociology"; and, by the by, this journalistic use of "Sociology" will itself be significant to the future historian of thought. But the transformation of industrial processes, the concentration of manufactures, trusts, trade-unionism and socialism,—machinery in agriculture, the new sources of grain supply, the effects of this on the old lands of the New World as well as of the Old,—of all this there is hardly a word.

But once one realizes that to call it "a review of progress in the chief departments of human activity" is simply a bit of advertising exaggeration, one can recognize that there are a good many excellent papers in the volume. One of the most striking is Mr. Carnegie's on the development of the steel manufacture in the United States, with its prophecy that the age of Bessemer steel is on the point of being succeeded by an age of Siemens. It could be wished that there were also an article on iron in the first three quarters of the century: "there lived brave men before Agamemnon." Mr. Finck's article on the musical century and Mr. Kenyon Cox's on painting are broad and illuminating *aperçus*; Dr. Billings gives cause, if not for optimism, for a sensible "meliorism" in his account of the progress of medicine: and Principal Lodge shows us how, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, the physicist is making his way through "Matter" and coming out at something remarkably like "Spirit." In other fields President Hadley and Mr. Midgeley provide valuable reviews of railroad development. If the advocates of railway nationalization are daunted by Dr. Hadley's judgment that "the results of government ownership are not greatly different from those of private" (p. 452), the remark will be equally surprising to those who have been accustomed to regard the President of Yale as a champion of "private enterprise." And, finally, Captain Willcox, of West Point, discourses on changes in military science in a way that is certainly instructive, but also shows that he had not had time to digest the recent lessons of South Africa. Most of the other articles can be passed over without special remark. Many are out of scale; but all present information in a more or less convenient form; and some have ideas.

W. J. ASHLEY.

Modern Europe, 1815-1899. By W. ALISON PHILLIPS, M.A.
New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. xii, 575.

MR. PHILLIPS has written a very good book but also a disappointing one. The goodness lies in what he has put into it, the disappointment in what he has chosen to leave out. "I have been forced," he says, "by lack of space to confine myself strictly to political history, to the neglect of those forces, economical, social, and religious, in which the

roots of politics are necessarily set." To this decision no reasonable exception could be taken had not the author further limited the scope of his work by interpreting "politics" as international politics and confining his attention to the external history of the states of Europe. He has dealt, as Fyffe has done, with those diplomatic and other questions that "show how the states of Europe have gained the form and character" which they possessed in 1899, and how a "Confederation of Europe" has been created. This part of the subject Mr. Phillips has treated with candor, skill, and accuracy, and his work furnishes the fullest and most reliable account, available for general reading, of the political history of modern Europe on the diplomatic side.

While recognizing the unmistakable merits of his book, we must say that the restraints which Mr. Phillips has placed upon himself are much to be regretted. Possibly conditions of time and circumstance have had something to do with this, for he has chosen the easier task. So well, however, has he done what he set out to do that it is a pity, considering the needs of his readers, that he should have stopped short of the more perfect work. In his preface he implies that such a limitation of his field was unavoidable. I do not think that anyone reading his book will agree with this contention. Masses of detail connected with the Greek and Belgian revolutions, with the Spanish and Portuguese civil struggles, with the activities of Mehemet Ali, and in general with the diplomatic manœuvres of the period from 1850 to 1871 might have been omitted with no such loss to the reader as is entailed in the omission of some of the epoch-making events in the history of the individual states. A different arrangement, combined with compression at some points and elaboration at others, would have enabled him to deal with questions of internal history without regard to their influence on the foreign complications. Such rearrangement, involving in no way a recasting of the work, would have made room for a discussion of the reform movement in England, the socialistic agitation in France and the rise of social democracy in Germany, the emancipation of the serfs in Russia, the industrial and commercial expansion of recent years, and other similar phases of European history that are of more importance in a work on modern Europe than are the petty political and dynastic quarrels of the smaller and even of some of the larger of the European states. This one-sided treatment has rendered the portions of the work that deal with the last thirty years particularly unsatisfactory because they do not in the least indicate the real forces at work during the period.

For these reasons we are forced to say that although Mr. Phillips has made an important addition to the small stock of good books on the nineteenth century he has not furnished the history that many expected him to write. The field is still open to anyone who desires to produce a good text-book covering the period since 1815.

There are some evidences of haste in the composition of the work. The word "hurry" is written all over the last sixty pages; the bibliography is noticeably incomplete and is inaccurate in the titles of some of

the works listed, while the latter are given without dates, editions, or the names of publishers. In the text there are a number of errors and many crudities of style. "Genua" should be "Genoa" (p. 8); "Grégoire" was not a regicide (p. 83); the Count of Artois was not childless (p. 85); *Comitati* is not Latin (p. 243); the *Ausgleich* is renewable every ten, not every seven years (p. 447); there is no chancellor of the Austrian Empire (*ibid.*); "eight years" on page 356 should be "five years"; the treaty of the Straits was signed in 1841 not in 1842 (p. 230); while there are many who will not agree with Mr. Phillips when he says (p. 526) that the peace of Europe to-day is founded on fear, or that France has gained nothing from the Dual Alliance. An Englishman, whose countrymen are ever ready to fasten on America responsibility for journalistic style, should not have been guilty of such expressions as "nigh on a century," "choke-full of prejudice," "a snatch victory," "brainspun fogs," "whilom governing classes," "in a huff"; while "forthrightness," "averse from," "functioned," "to treat with the king direct," are not English at all. On page 415 is a group of sentences made up of a wonderful compound of "shes" and "hers." Apart from these slips the style is not unattractive.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Two Wars: An Autobiography of General Samuel G. French.
(Nashville, Tenn: Confederate Veteran. 1901. Pp. xvi, 404.)

THIS is a well-written volume, full of interest, abounding in incident, and friendly references to many of the most distinguished officers both of the Mexican and the Civil War. It is graphic in its descriptions of battles and its portrayal of conditions in the south at the outbreak of the Civil War, during that war, at its close, and throughout the Reconstruction period. The chapter on West Point and Army Post life, and those on the war with Mexico are presented in an entertaining style. The author was a northern man, and a West Point graduate. He left the army a few years before the war and settled in Mississippi. At its outbreak he entered the Confederate army and became a division commander. He was an excellent soldier.

His book, however, is that of one who has not progressed with the times, who shares the heated views of 1861, who sneers at "Yankees," who, while proclaiming himself loyal to the Constitution, citing as good proof of it that he offered his services in the war with Spain, still believes in the right of secession. In these respects it is a pernicious book, its teachings are those of a dead past, and wholly out of tune with the living, progressive, promising and united present. His volume opens with the dedication to wife and children, and to the confederate soldiers "who battled with the invading foe to protect our homes and maintain the cause for which Oliver Cromwell and George Washington fought." Its concluding chapter contains this opinion: "Appomattox terminated the war only—it was not a court to adjudicate the right of secession—but its sequence established the fact that secession was not treason nor

rebellion, and that it yet exists, restrained only by the question of expediency."

If General French had published his volume while the leading Confederate commanders were alive he would have been kept busy with his controversies during the rest of his life. He sneers at Governor Pettus, of Mississippi, ridicules Bishop Polk and his staff; charges Hardee with the "deliberately planned trick" of putting him, French, "where he was subject to a reverse fire of artillery from the enemy"; and makes continuous and sustained attacks on Hood. He quotes frequently from the *War Records* volumes, showing that he had access to them, but does not hesitate to neglect them at times. For example, he gives the Confederate loss at Kenesaw as 552, and says: "What the Federal loss was I do not know, but it is estimated at from five to eight thousand." These figures he emphasizes by italics. The *Records* show the loss to have been 2,500.

His accounts of battles are vivid, and not only full of interest but valuable through the presentation of a mass of incidents which make most attractive war pictures. The frequent and lengthy quotations from a well-kept diary extending through the war are of importance historically. It is to be regretted that this diary could not have been obtained and published in full in the *War Records* series. As an evidence of its completeness, the portions quoted in the present volume would have filled over fifty pages of the government publication. The complete diary would have presented lively passages for every day of the war concerning the most striking features of each day's operations by a trained soldier who at the same time was a close observer. The attack on General Hood for his Tennessee campaign is the most severe yet published from the Confederate side.

A northern man himself he indulges in somewhat too frequent flings at Yankees, and emphasizes his contempt by the new and striking phrase of "colored Yankees" as applied to negro soldiers. Still it was perhaps necessary for him to be extreme in this direction since General Joseph E. Johnston, when French was ordered to report to him, wrote to President Davis that as General French was of northern birth his arrival would "weaken instead of strengthen us."

While the volume is interesting, well-written, and breezy throughout, and contains new, and doubtless reliable details on many historical points, its value to the general reader, who has not the means at hand to test its statements, will be much diminished by the ridiculous positions of the appendix, which seeks to show by figures that the northern army was largely foreign; that with foreigners, and whites and negroes from the South, the North had "a force 350,414 stronger than the whole Confederate army, without enlisting a native born citizen of the north, also that the south furnished the north 455,414 men." There is much in the appendix of fifty pages as worthless as this. In addition to its many merits, it possesses special value from the fact that it so recalls the gloom and bitterness of the old time as to serve by contrast to make the cheer and brightness of the present brighter still.

H. V. BOYNTON.

Lincoln's Plan of Reconstruction. By CHARLES H. MCCARTHY, Ph.D.
(New York: McClure, Phillips and Co. 1901. Pp. xxiv, 531.)

HOWEVER small the difference may often be, there is nevertheless a distinction between the military and the political success of a war; and Mr. McCarthy shows in the book before us that Lincoln recognized this distinction and had a lively realization of the possibility that he might haply fail of the latter even though securing the former. Not only must the forces in arms against the national government be suppressed, but new state governments must be reconstructed in the revolted land which would rule there in harmony with national ideals.

Three chapters of Mr. McCarthy's book are devoted to the reconstruction of Tennessee, Louisiana and Arkansas upon the President's initiative and one to the reorganization of western Virginia upon the voluntary initiative of the loyal citizens. The sketches are amply full to show President Lincoln's purposes and methods and to disclose the obstacles which justified his anxious watchfulness over the process. But an intense study of Reconstruction from the standpoint of the governors and the people governed is not made. The necessity of incorporating the abolition of slavery into the reconstructed governments is an idea that grew upon the President and the fifth chapter traces its development. The five chapters that follow exhibit the lack of co-operation, even the opposition, between President Lincoln and Congress, culminating in the veto of the Wade-Davis Bill and the refusal of Congress to recognize the states which the President had reconstructed. The summary of the debates in Congress, which constitutes the bulk of these chapters, is skilfully made and lucid. The author holds that "the legislative branch of government was the authority least objectionable for controlling the informal changes in the nature of the Union" (p. 470). The eleventh chapter shows the bearing of the Hampton Roads conference and other incidents of the war upon Lincoln's work of reconstruction. The twelfth and final chapter brings the sketch down to the opening of the Thirty-ninth Congress in December, 1865, when President Johnson had ceased to declare "that 'rebels' must take a back seat in the work of restoration" and "had come to believe that 'the people must be trusted with their government'" (p. 463).

A study of the "character of the reconstructed governments as well as the spirit and tendency of their legislation" is deferred in the belief that it "belongs properly to a treatise on Congressional reconstruction, a theme to which this essay is only introductory." Thus the book as a whole purports to be but the introduction to an unwritten volume, albeit a bulky introduction that has cost great labor and pains, and that, on the points which it covers, will save much labor of research to students in the same field.

But the reviewer feels justified in suggesting that this self-imposed limitation constitutes a defect in the scope of the book; that it should be completed by a thorough study from local sources of Presidential Reconstruction down to 1865 in the states where it went into operation; and

that the history of Tennessee should be continued down through the election of 1869. Tennessee was reconstructed by President Lincoln, Governor Johnson and Governor Brownlow and was recognized by Congress in 1866. Under the Brownlow régime the disfranchising acts were severe and the government was in the hands of unquestioned Unionists. But in 1869 the majority of the white citizens of the state by hook and by crook took possession of the state government. The reviewer is of the opinion that such a study would reduce Presidential Reconstruction to a dilemma: either government of the southern states by a very few of their citizens, satisfactory to the powers at Washington, unendurable to the majority of the citizens and leading to revolution; or government by the majority of the citizens, satisfactory to the ruling class, unsatisfactory to the powers at Washington and provocative of bitter feeling and national interference with local affairs. Congressional Reconstruction would surely reduce to the same dilemma. If the point is well taken a book which omits discussion of this phase of the question, difficult, elusive, and delicate as it may be, is open to the criticism of incompleteness.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

Zur jüngsten deutschen Vergangenheit. Erster Ergänzungsband.
VON KARL LAMPRECHT, Professor der Geschichte an der Universität Leipzig. (Berlin: R. Gaertners Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1902. Pp. xxi, 471.)

PROFESSOR LAMPRECHT'S *Kulturgeschichte* is naturally not so well known in America as in Germany where to speak of it is to invite controversy. So a word about his method and point of view, even in so short a notice as this, can not be out of place. Lamprecht accepts evolution as a fundamental fact. He writes history accordingly. In the introduction of the volume before us, he says (p. x): "the greatest sin of the historian of to-day is the piling up of facts based on poorly digested materials. Of such works we have enough and to spare; indeed we are about to be buried beneath these uncritical productions. To bring out of the chaos of evidence and the heaps of books a simple, straightforward account of the historical phenomena of our time has been my steadfast purpose." It is not his plan, then, to give notes and references. So we need not expect to find the text standing high upon a bridge of foot-notes and citations. He says history has to do with the total "soul-life" of a people and not simply with the political events of national development. He divides German history into four periods: conventional soul-life—*Urzeit* and Middle Ages; individual soul-life—Modern Times to 1789; subjectivism—Recent Times (1789 to 1870); and the present day (1870–1902)—*Reizsamkeit* or something like nervousity (pp. vii–viii). This plan has been about half completed. From 1890 to 1895 he published the *Deutsche Geschichte* in six volumes which brings the narrative down to 1648. Since 1895, Lamprecht has been the object of attack from all sides. The Ranke school, strongest perhaps in Berlin, has felt itself much aggrieved that Lamprecht should have cut loose from all the ties of tradi-

tion and pursued a new and untrodden way. A Lamprecht school, with Leipzig as a storm center, has arisen and to all appearances it has won in the fight for *Kulturgeschichte*. Here has been a veritable battle of words and not a little "mud has been thrown." Lamprecht himself ceased his writing to defend in magazine and pamphlet the principles he had laid down and carried out in the *Deutsche Geschichte*. About one thousand articles and pamphlets for and against Lamprecht have appeared during the last half dozen years.

Since the contest seems to be won, Lamprecht has taken up his work again, though not at 1648 where he left off, but at 1870. He gives us *Zur jüngsten deutschen Vergangenheit* in two volumes, of which Volume I. is before us. The period of 1648 to 1870 he leaves untouched, promising to fill out the blank at an early date. An outline of the subjects treated in this last volume of the *Deutsche Geschichte* and some emphasis of the method pursued is all that can be attempted in this review.

The volume is divided into four books: music, painting and sculpture, poetry, and *Weltanschauung*; that is, a description of the forces and influences now most visible in any large German city. The subject rightly begins with music and with Richard Wagner as its representative figure. Wagner is certainly a phenomenon of recent art-history and Lamprecht includes all branches of intellectual activity in history. In this first division of his subject the author traces the development of music from the simple battle song and church chant of medieval Europe to the complex *Götterdämmerung* of our day. Bach is the last of the medievals and the first of the moderns; Gluck begins and Beethoven closes the so-called classic music; Weber, Spohr and Schumann are the great romanticists; and Liszt prepares the way for Wagner. Then he reviews rapidly Wagner's development up to his masterly poetic tragedies in sound and measure. And here Wagner is shown to be a product in part of Schopenhauer; he is akin to Nietzsche, and to Carlyle and Ruskin. The influence of the great German pessimists on the music of our day is clearly shown. No one can read this chapter without desiring to hear the *Nibelungen Ring* again; nor can a reader of Lamprecht hear a Wagnerian opera without feeling that the historian has looked deep into the sources of our art-life.

The second subject with which this volume deals is *Bildende Kunst*—painting and sculpture; and after reviewing rapidly the foreign schools of painting and sculpture, it traces the gradual change in Germany from the formalism of the early years of the last century to the physiologists of Düsseldorf and Munich, to the pessimist-naturalists—Boecklin and Klinger—to the impressionists who at present have such a hold on art connoisseurs of Europe. Seffner's bust of King Albert of Saxony is given as the best piece of statuary done after the physiological-impressionist school of the eighties. Wiedermann and Maree are given as masters to be classed with Seffner. In the third book, poetry and the drama receive equally critical attention. The development of the realist school from Hoffmann, Auerbach and Sternbach to the later *antibürger-*

liche school which prepared the way for the real masters of German literature of the present, Hauptmann and Sudermann. And these are close akin to Zola and the French realists.

But Lamprecht is at his best in Book IV. where the *Weltanschauung* of the representative men of the present is the subject. He is himself a philosopher, a friend and co-worker with Wundt. According to Lamprecht, Nietzsche's influence pervades the music, the art, the literature in part of the last two decades (p. 409). Tracing the changes from Kant to Fichte; from the semi-psychologists of the second decade of the nineteenth century to Hegel, from Hegel to Schopenhauer (the fashion of the fifties and sixties), he comes to the strange half-poet philosopher, who has gained such wide-spread following during the last fifteen years, the mad philosopher of Naumburg, Nietzsche. Nietzsche was influenced by Darwin, by Schopenhauer, but he rid himself of the pessimism of the latter before his work was interrupted by madness. His *Weltanschauung* is that of the majority of the better classes of young men in Germany. Its backbone is the inequality of man; that man must find himself and find opportunities for self-manifestation even at the cost of life to his weaker fellow. There is no dead level in the physical world; there is none in the intellectual, the spiritual (pp. 410-411). Wundt, "the greatest philosopher since Kant," represents the culmination of philosophical evolution — and experimental psychology is its fruit; it is at the same time the basis for all further advance. The categories of Kant, the idealism of Fichte and Schelling, the pessimism of the fifties are all superseded by Wundt. Wundt's work makes necessary the reconstruction of philosophy, the reconstruction of all non-physical sciences. History is one of these.

The mission of history, Lamprecht maintains, is to depict *das seelische Leben*, all intellectual activity (p. 81); not to portray great men as Giesebrecht has done, not to outline "the ideas of God among men" like Ranke (pp. 460-461). Heroes and hero-worship have small chance with Lamprecht. The hero does not exist except as a product of soul-movements among peoples. Such are some of the principal ideas brought out in this latest volume of *Kulturgeschichte*. Judging from Lamprecht's method in his previous work, it is to be expected that the second volume of *Zur jüngsten deutschen Vergangenheit* will outline the political movements of the last thirty years in Germany, which can not but be interesting.

Style is one of Lamprecht's strong points. He is never tiresome, never dry, full of illustration and oft surprising in the breadth and depth of his learning. His book reads like Green's *History of the English People*. He deserves to be read widely in America and the hope has been expressed that the *Deutsche Geschichte* which has been translated into Russian, which is now being rendered into French, may find a translator in this country.

WM. E. DODD.

American Statesmen. Edited by JOHN T. MORSE, Jr. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1898-1900. 32 vols.)

THIS handsome "standard library edition" is a reissue in uniform style, and with the addition of an index volume, of the well-known "American Statesmen" series. Now that the work is published as a whole, Mr. Morse is able to add, what he could not very well have added before, a general preface to the series and special introductions to certain of the volumes. The biographies are further grouped in five periods, those of Franklin, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry and Washington forming the Revolutionary period, those of John Adams, Hamilton, Morris, Jay and Marshall the Constructive period, those of Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, Monroe, J. Q. Adams and Randolph the period of Jeffersonian Democracy, while the period designated as "Domestic Politics: the Tariff and Slavery" claims Jackson, Van Buren, Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Benton and Cass, and that of the Civil War Lincoln, Seward, Chase, C. F. Adams, Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens.

In his brief general introduction to the series, the editor undertakes to explain the principle on which his selection has been made, and to illustrate it by brief comment on three or four typical names. The substance of what he has to say in his own defence, and, on the whole, the best characterization of the spirit of the series, is in these sentences:

"It has been the editor's intention to deal with the advancement of the country. When the people have moved steadily along any road, the men who have led them on that road have been selected as subjects. When the people have refused to enter upon a road, or, having entered, have soon turned back from it, the leaders upon such inchoate or abandoned excursions have for the most part been rejected. Those who have been exponents of ideas and principles which have entered into the progress and have developed in a positive way the history of the nation have been chosen; those who have unfortunately linked themselves with rejected ideas and principles have themselves also been rejected. Calhoun has been made an exception to this rule, for reasons so obvious that they need not be rehearsed" (pp. vii, viii).

It has been the intention to make this edition not only a new edition, but a revised edition as well, and two or three of the volumes have been materially changed in form. With a few exceptions, the remaining volumes show no very important changes beyond those of a literary character, such as a different turn of phrase or a new grouping of paragraphs, though of course only a line for line comparison would enable one to detect minute alterations. The new preface to Tyler's *Patrick Henry*, for example, speaks of "minute revision from beginning to end" and "numerous changes both in its substance and in its form," but a somewhat careful comparison of considerable sections of the two editions shows no very large differences, save the occasional use of new material traceable to William Wirt Henry's *Patrick Henry* and Kate Mason Rowlands's *George Mason*, and a few additions to the bibliography. Mr. Lodge is able to give a fuller and more modern statement of the Washington pedigree, in

accordance with the researches of Mr. Henry E. Waters. Mr. Morse's *John Adams* also stands as originally written, though in his preface the author states that further study has convinced him that the strictures which he has made upon Franklin during the period of the latter's stay in France, especially while Adams was with him, "are unjust in their severity, and give a false idea of the true usefulness of that able diplomatist at that time"; but the matter is allowed to stand, with this *caveat*, as "a fair presentation of the view held by John Adams himself, and which was often and vigorously expressed by him."

The most important changes in the new edition are in the volumes on Monroe, Jackson, Cass and Seward. For the revision of his life of Monroe Dr. Gilman has had the help of the calendar of Monroe's correspondence in the Department of State and the first volume of Hamilton's writings of Monroe, and from these sources he has been able to add a good deal to the personal representation of Monroe's opinions, besides re-enforcing many statements of detail. Most of the letters cited refer to Monroe's relations with Jefferson, and emphasize the intimacy between the two statesmen. On pages 177-179, by way of commenting on Reddaway's discussion of the origin of the Monroe doctrine, Dr. Gilman says:

"To me this discussion seems more important to the antiquary than to the historian; for if further research should establish beyond question the authorship as that of Adams, the fact will still remain that the President and not the secretary of state announced the doctrine. It was his official sanction which gave authority to the phrases, by whomsoever they were written, and lifted them far above the plane of personal opinions. Monroe spoke from the chair of the Chief Executive; and to him statesmen and historians have continuously attributed the doctrine. His official station, at a critical moment, gave to his words authority; and their pronounced acceptance by the people of the United States shows how accurately they express the sentiments of the people."

Of further changes in this volume, Professor Jameson's summary of Monroe's annual messages, which formed part of the appendix to the old edition, is here transferred as a chapter to the body of the book, and the bibliography by the same hand adds sections on the application of the Monroe doctrine to the Pan-American conference and the Venezuela-Guiana boundary.

Professor Sumner's *Jackson* embodies numerous changes in both substance and content. The author has had the use of the Ford collection of letters from Jackson to William B. Lewis, and makes frequent references to and quotations from them. Running over the pages one notes the addition of a long passage on the political issues between the Federalists and the Republicans (pp. 11-13), a new paragraph on Jackson's desire for the governorship of Orleans Territory (pp. 17-18), and additional matter about the New Orleans pirates (pp. 45-46), the executions at Mobile (pp. 52-53), the Louaillier affair (pp. 53-57), and the "*demos krato*" principle (p. 128). Former chapters 8-11 have been condensed into one, with considerable change of arrangement

but, on the whole, amplification and improvement of statement. There is also a fuller account of Jackson's life after 1837.

Professor McLaughlin's *Cass* shows a number of changes of form and some important ones of substance. The estimate of Hull is modified, the author "thinking that the statement did not make sufficient allowance for the difficulties with which he was surrounded, and that it did not sufficiently take into consideration the fact that to some extent he was the victim of an incompetent military administration" (p. vii). The account of Cass's re-election in 1849, when it was clear that Cass "no longer represented as he had done the growing sentiment of the Northwest," is somewhat expanded (pp. 265-266), and a note is added (pp. 356-357) in defence of the author's general estimate of Cass's character.

In Mr. Lothrop's *Seward* a materially different interpretation is given to Seward's famous letter to Lincoln of April 1, 1861, than occurs in the first edition. It was in this letter that, after suggesting that the President "demand explanations from Spain and France categorically, at once," a declaration of war to follow if the explanations were not satisfactory, and also "seek explanations from Great Britain and Russia, and send agents into Canada, Mexico, and Central America to rouse a vigorous continental spirit of independence on this continent against European intervention," Seward went on to hint that, if Lincoln was averse to such procedure, he himself would be willing to undertake it. Mr. Lothrop now states, on the authority of Mr. F. W. Seward, that Seward when he wrote the letter "knew not merely of the revolution in San Domingo . . . but also . . . that France and Spain were actively discussing schemes for invading Mexico and establishing a European protectorate there, also that Great Britain and Russia had been sounded on this subject"; and that he thought promptness and boldness the best means of breaking up the plans before they were matured. As for Seward's "suggestion of his readiness to assume further responsibilities, if called upon to do so," that, in Mr. Lothrop's opinion, "was simply a declaration of his readiness to be helpful in any way that he could, and was without any selfish or ambitious purpose on his part." The discussion is too long to quote, but the explanation is interesting and important.

The successive volumes of the "American Statesmen" series have been so thoroughly written about as they have appeared that little is left for a reviewer besides noting the chief points of difference between the old edition and the new, and estimating briefly the worth of the series as a whole. That the biographies have taken their place at once among the scanty list of "standard" works on American history, and that in their new form, though sold only by subscription, they will enter upon a new lease of life, probably goes without saying. It is a sound instinct, if not a completely developed one, that finds in biography the chief interest of history: for history, whatever else its subject-matter may be, does deal pre-eminently with men. Mr. Morse's great undertaking does not, of course, give a complete view of the period it covers, but it probably comes as near to it as any series of biographical studies can. It

would be idle to quarrel with the selection of names, for on the list as a whole no two authorities would be likely wholly to agree; but they are all notable names, and names inseparable from that "forward movement" which Mr. Morse has consistently sought to trace. Taken as a whole, the series shows careful editorial supervision and uncommon restraint, while in its clearness and accuracy of statement, its well-planned proportions, its avoidance of undue repetition and overlapping, and its distinct literary interest, its merits are not only everywhere apparent, but are in themselves decidedly notable.

No review of this edition would be complete without cordial reference to the index volume prepared by Professor Theodore Clarke Smith. The index itself is in two parts—an index of names, and a topical index to the contents of the series. The latter, while not rivalling in its detail the index which a single volume would contain, has the advantage of bringing together, in the place where the inquirer would be likely to seek it, the material scattered through all the volumes. So far as we have tested it, its entries are accurate and its selection of topics adequate. Following the index is a select bibliography, also topically arranged, and giving lists of the most useful books for the further study of the men and events treated in the series. Mr. Morse, in a happily-worded preface, voices his appreciation of Professor Smith's service in thus giving unity and value to the entire work, and those who use the volumes will certainly echo his words.

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

The Life and Letters of John Richard Green. Edited by LESLIE STEPHEN. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. vii, 512.)

THE letters of the author of the *Short History of the English People* are full of that personal charm which constitutes the essential characteristic of an entertaining biography. His contagious enthusiasm, his wit,—though sometimes conscious and forced,—his devotion to hard work, all are strongly brought out in the letters, and serve in combination to attract and hold attention, as well as his firm conviction that in giving his best to historical writing he was performing his best service to his fellows. But for students of history, the main interest is inevitably in Green's own opinions, as expressed in familiar letters, upon the purpose and method of his *Short History*. The "Little Book" as Green always called it, had its inception in an early plan to write a history of the Church of England, a plan soon set aside, but inevitably influencing the character of the work actually performed. Thus religion and church organization were ranked with literature and social forces as of prime importance in portraying the development of the English nation. Green's championship of Freeman in the controversy with Froude, his expressed opinion that Froude had written "a history of England with England left out," increased his own tendency to depart from the customary grooves of historical writing, while his repeated sojourns in Italy resulted in the fixed belief that "drum and trumpet" histories for all countries must give way

to analyses of social and religious causes. He wrote to Freeman: "I think moral and intellectual facts as much facts for the historian as military or political facts"; and again: "Every word I have written in reviews and essays through the last ten years went to the same point, to a protest, that is, against the tendency to a merely external political view of human affairs, and to a belief that political history to be intelligible and just must be based on social history in its largest sense." The sudden cessation in his *Short History* of all literary comment after 1660 is justified by Green on the ground that after that date science and industry, not literature, stood in the forefront of national characteristics.

In method Green intentionally attempted the rôle of the story teller, being encouraged thereto by Bryce's opinion that a story was essential in all elementary works and that to do such work well was a distinct achievement. Bryce told him that "these little things must be done by big people, they are the most difficult things of all to do." Freeman, a friendly critic, objected earnestly to Green's imagination and to his habit of "personifying" events, as well as to the omission of exact dates. He seriously chided Green for writing that Château-Gaillard represented "the ruin of a system as well as a camp; from its dark donjon we see not merely the pleasant vale of Seine, but the sedge flats of our own Runnymede." Green's reply was "Why on earth *did* you go to sleep when you might have had such a sight." Of another historical description, Freeman asked "where do you kill T. Seymour?" but Green did not care to kill him at all; he ignored him on the theory that "what we want in history is to know which are the big facts and which are the little ones." Green's own criticisms of his book, after publication, are all directed toward those chapters in which he deserted his favorite methods for the "narrative of events" style advocated by his friends. He considered his weakest work to be the chapters on Richard II. and the Wars of the Roses, a judgment in which all who have used the book as a text will instantly agree.

In general the letters given by Mr. Stephen will prove of great interest to students of history, for they are full of ideas on methods of historical research and historical writing, but there is little to attract the general reader. Green, if his letters constitute good evidence, was, in spite of the editor's statements to the contrary, conspicuously lacking in interest in contemporary events, or in anything in fact save his own particular field. The present volume is then chiefly of value for its illumination of Green's mental attitude, his purpose, and his methods in the study and the writing of history.

E. D. ADAMS.

Essai sur Taine. Son Œuvre et son Influence, d'après des Documents Inédits, avec des Extraits de Quarante Articles de Taine non Recueillis dans ses Œuvres. Par VICTOR GIRAUD. Deuxième Édition. (Paris: Hachette. 1901. Pp. xxxi, 311.)

PROFESSOR GIRAUD's excellent book is the outcome of a study of Taine begun over ten years ago, the first fruits of which were submitted,

in the form of a manuscript essay, to the master himself. Taine was naturally pleased and the encouragement he gave his young student stimulated the latter to the further study and research that resulted in the first edition of the present volume which appeared, if one may judge from the date of the long preface, in the autumn of 1900. While it was passing through the press, Mme Taine voluntarily placed the unpublished manuscripts, notes, and other papers of her husband in Professor Giraud's hands. Although this material confirmed rather than shook the author's confidence in the points of view he had adopted, it invited or necessitated much retouching of his book. In consequence we have this revised edition which is well worthy of the legend it bears: "crowned by the French Academy." It is equally worthy of the index one looks for in vain, but the analytical table of contents partly makes up for the deficiency. Its value is enhanced by appendices containing extracts from forty articles not republished by Taine, as well as fragments of the *Origines*, and certain condensed expressions of opinion about Taine's work proceeding from French and English critics. The student will be glad to have these appendices, which form about a third of the book, but will probably conclude with the general reader that Professor Giraud's own monograph scarcely needed their support.

The essay falls into four main divisions or very long chapters. The first gives a careful and subtle discussion of the history of Taine's thought and his books. It is fortified with elaborate foot-notes, which are often as interesting as the text, and it may be safely commended as a valuable study of the character and work of the great French critic and historian. It is also such a model of condensed yet thoroughly inclusive criticism, that one is led to believe that its prime value to the American student lies not so much in the contribution it makes to the literature that is growing up around Taine's work as in the critical and stylistic methods its author so successfully employs.

The long first chapter is followed by three shorter ones treating Taine as logician and poet and discussing his influence. These chapters are in their way as good as the first, and excellent also is the short "Conclusion" which enforces the main ideas brought out in the body of the book, to wit that while Taine was primarily a thinker and lived to think, he embraced too early an excessively simple system of thought by which he rashly attempted to explain practically the entire work of civilization, but that, whatever his limitations, he remains a very great writer and a still greater man. With these conclusions there will probably be no quarrel to-day, and it would require a very minute knowledge of Taine to enable anyone to take serious exception to the numerous special judgments passed by Professor Giraud. Perhaps in the chapter that discusses Taine's influence he is a little too complimentary to living writers, yet this is an amiable fault which might almost be esteemed a virtue in this country. Surely, however, few Americans would feel justified in referring to such an author as M. Zola with the contempt M. Giraud allows himself to express, not only because sound criticism does not demand it, but

because courtesy forbids it. This and a few other blemishes may be noted in the volume; but on the other hand it would demand considerable space even to mention the passages one is tempted to mark for approbation and rereading. Two of these may be indicated—the comparison of Taine and Renan (p. 100) and the ingenious discussion of the limitations of the theories underlying the famous *History of English Literature* (p. 123).

W. P. TRENT.

James Russell Lowell. A Biography. By HORACE E. SCUDDER. (New York and Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1901. Two vols., pp. x, 456; 482.)

STUDENTS and readers of American history, if they go beneath the mere surface phenomena of war and politics, will naturally turn with interest to the life of an American, who is now recognized as our leading man of letters, who was deeply interested in the character and the progress of his country, and who was strongly affected by its successes and its tribulations. We may naturally expect to find in the biography of Lowell new light on the anti-slavery movement and on abolitionism, and to understand better how the separation of the North and South affected a man of strong national sympathies who had been reared amid the peculiar influences of Puritanism. We may naturally expect to find here new material that will enable us to understand Southern Reconstruction and the national regeneration; we may hope to be able to see more clearly into the darkness of Grant's administration and the causes of the Mugwump defection, because we see and hear the comments of a clear-minded, clean-souled man upon the conditions of public life. But the reader of this new biography of Lowell will, in many respects, if not in all, be disappointed, when he attempts to obtain from the volumes new light on American history in any ordinary sense of the word. The writer did not seek to furnish material for the student, to treat Lowell as a type, to collect such words or catalogue such sensations as might enable the reader to weigh more accurately political motives or even the conditions of social progress. Mr. Scudder was pre-eminently interested in Lowell as a man of letters; was interested moreover not in his influence on others, but in the impressions made by friends, by passing events, by literature, by family misfortune on the mind and spirit of Lowell himself. Here indeed one finds a real biography; all the more real because it deals not with outward seemings or the mere trappings of life but with the actual man, who lay behind all that was merely phenomenal. It may well be doubted whether one can find anywhere in literature a more earnest or, on the whole, a more successful attempt to trace the growth, the modification, the gradual unfolding of the inner spirit of a poet.

That we do not get much new light on the important and critical occurrences in American history need, therefore, not surprise us. The important thing to Mr. Scudder was not the Mexican War and the annexation of Texas, not the accession of the southern states or the political significance of the affairs in England while Lowell was minister plenipo-

tentiary, not, in short, any of the things that one customarily finds in biographies of men who have played somewhat conspicuous rôles in public affairs. As a matter of fact, the duties that devolved on Lowell while minister, as far as they are treated at all in these pages, seem dragged in largely because the writer scarcely dared to leave them out; they are superficial, extraneous, and without significance in the unfolding of the man. A discussion with Mr. Blaine on the condition of Irish-American patriots in English prisons is interesting; but the reader is sure to feel with Mr. Scudder, as soon as he becomes submissive to the author's method, that such an event is a mere aside. If then the reader is sincere with himself and will agree to read these volumes in order to learn more about Lowell—rather than to do, as we are all accustomed to do, read a man's life in order to study something else than the subject of the biography—he will confess when the volumes are finished that he has read a masterly piece of work, written with finest and most sensitive appreciation, expressed in the best of smooth, vigorous, wholesome English, a book in which the author has dared—and dared successfully—to handle the most subtle matters with deliberation and nicety of judgment, and to weigh in the balances substances delicate and altogether impalpable for the unpractised hand.

There are, however, some portions of the volumes that will have special interest for the student of American politics. Notable among these is the chapter entitled "Lowell and the War for the Union." An editorial in the *Atlantic*, just before the outbreak of the war, deserves special mention. It is written in Lowell's best form; it is keen, direct, bold, virile, and, while expressed with the customary felicity of language, is devoid of the over-elaboration and the hypercritical care which sometimes seem to detract from the masculine vigor of his prose. In such writing as this we see the man and not the author; we see the original reformer and idealist who now was not content with picking phrases or compounding musical metaphors. Mr. Scudder, who it must be said is rarely fault-finding, suggests that the writing contains "that sort of coruscation of language which tends to conceal point and application," but the reader finds difficulty in agreeing with the criticism; the piece is vehement but natural; there is scarcely anything in the two volumes more real, unless it be the strangely pathetic words of composure, in which Lowell tells of the death of his nephew, Willie, on the battlefield, and the home-coming of the brave lad's body to the distracted mother. We get in these lines, that tell of this simple incident, a view of the Civil War that is not given us by long muster rolls or tabulated death losses that run into the tens of thousands.

One word of unfavorable criticism must, unfortunately, be said, and this adds rather than detracts from our estimate of Mr. Scudder's powers. He seems to have been placed at a disadvantage by the previous publication of Lowell's *Letters*, which were thus defended by copyright from being freely used for purpose of illustration or when it was desirable that Lowell should tell his own story. The author was obliged to quote in

some instances, not the most significant, but the less significant portions of Lowell's correspondence. I do not mean to suggest that the firm publishing the letters was ungenerous or that Mr. Norton was unsympathetic; on the contrary, Mr. Scudder acknowledges the courtesy of the publishers and the friendly counsel and guidance of Mr. Norton. But withal a careful perusal of the book leaves the impression with the reader that the writer was more than once oppressed by poverty and forced to use unpublished material when the printed letters would have been more helpful. Possibly even this criticism is unmerited; and whether it be or not, those who have appreciated Lowell as one of the purest products of American life and have known the serene, refined man who has written these volumes and who through life did so much to encourage others, must be unfeignedly glad that their names are joined together in a piece of work so wholly worthy of admiration.

Historic Towns of the Western States. Edited by LYMAN P. POWELL. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901. Pp. xxxvi, 702.)

THIS volume completes a series of four, its predecessors treating of the Historic Towns of New England, of the Middle, and of the Southern States. Ranging from Marietta on the east to the Pacific coast twenty-three towns are described,—some scarcely more than villages but most of them cities, and all possessed of interest as scenes of important and picturesque events. Each town appears to have been cared for by one of its citizens, and the sketches naturally vary much in merit. Among the writers are a few names of distinction, notably Mr. R. G. Thwaites, who furnishes the introduction and the account of Madison; but it is only fair to say that some of the most interesting descriptions come from those who have escaped fame.

The oldest of the historic towns are those farthest west, and the newest those farthest east. When Marietta, Cincinnati and Cleveland began, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Monterey and Santa Fé possessed a history running back a century or two. The line of the Aryan advance has certainly been from the eastward, in the old world and the new; yet the heart of our continent was attacked, first, from the south and west; De Soto marching from near the Gulf of Mexico after his progress from Florida, and Coronado reaching the Mississippi valley in an expedition from the Gulf of California. After a long interval, the second approach to the heart of the continent was made by the French from the far north, the path-breakers coming in from Lake Superior and upper Michigan. After this, nearly a century passed before Anglo-Saxondom fairly broke over the Alleghenies, following the line of advance really most direct.

The story of the towns founded by English-speaking men is interesting, but for romance and pathos we must go to those built by our Latin predecessors. Other men labored; we have entered into their labors; and the displacement of these precursors by our prosaic and tumultuous life is often touched by tragedy. Detroit, Des Moines, St. Paul, St. Louis, Vincennes, are now French only in name, with scarce a trace in their

populations of the indomitable and adventurous race that planted them. Soon the same thing will be true of the Spanish towns of the remoter west. All the more reason then that a knowledge of their past should be cherished—a past dim and dreamy, pervaded by sights and sounds remote from our experience,—the figures of cavaliers in mail, of priests robed and tonsured marching at the word of absolute commanders, or in the wilderness kneeling at the peal from some mission of consecrated bells.

As we lay down this book we find that no pages have made a stronger impression than those recording the adventures of Father Junipero Serra, the Franciscan monk, who, coming from the island of Majorca, played a great part in America. Just at this moment, in an island but a day's sail distant, Napoleon Bonaparte was born; and Mr. Harold Bolce, who tells the story, makes the startling claim that the work of the monk (of whom we believe most of the readers of this book will now hear for the first time) affected the world more profoundly than that of the soldier. Spain, it seems, just after the middle of the eighteenth century, had determined to give up as profitless the stretch of coast from San Diego northward. Had she done so the coast would certainly have fallen into strong hands. Behring was near at hand prepared to seize the land for Russia as far southward "as the sea-otter ran"; Captain Cook was ready to appropriate for England whatever was unoccupied; La Pérouse, too, in the interest of Louis XVI., looking for chances to plant the *fleur-de-lis*, pushed into the harbors as he sailed down the shore. Father Junipero, however, had gone northward from Mexico with bell, book and knotted cord. He infused his zeal into crowds of Indian neophytes. He restored the crumbling walls of the old missions, and marked again with proper peals matins, nones and vespers; and, when nothing else would do, journeyed through the wilderness back to Mexico to persuade the viceroy to hold on yet longer. So, says Mr. Bolce, Spain served as a trustee until in the fulness of time Uncle Sam entered upon the scene, assuming what the Dons had become too weak to hold. It was all the work of Father Junipero, building so much wiser than he knew: but what pangs would have wrung the soul of the faithful monk had he known what was coming from his labors!

JAMES K. HOSMER.

A Short History of the Mississippi Valley. By JAMES K. HOSMER.
(Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1901.
Pp. xv, 230.)

THIS is an interesting little volume sketching some of the important episodes in the occupation of the great central valley of the Union. Dr. Hosmer has a readable, story-telling style, and he has made a useful book for the general reader. It cannot be said, however, that he has added to our knowledge of the field which he discusses, and the influence of writers like John Fiske, Theodore Roosevelt, and Henry Adams upon the author is obvious. Dr. Hosmer even follows Roosevelt into spelling Boone, "Boon," failing to note that this error was corrected in the

later editions of the *Winning of the West*. The picturesque elements of Mr. Roosevelt's narrative have even entrapped Dr. Hosmer into repeating the unfounded story of Clark's dramatic appearance in the ballroom at the capture of Kaskaskia. A slight investigation into the sources ought to have saved him from this mistake. But the author falls into some strange errors on his own account. As a case in point, his treatment of the Indian negotiations of George Rogers Clark at Cahokia after the conquest may be noted. In that episode Dr. Hosmer brings in distant Indian tribes for whom there seems to be no satisfactory authority, and he gives a description of the negotiations which places Clark in a spectacular position quite out of character with the man. "On the third day of the council," he writes, "certain of the savages set out to seize upon him. Clark, however, anticipated them, snatching out the offenders as they stood in the midst of the hesitating crowd, and casting them straightway into chains. A sign of timidity would have brought upon his little company a rain of tomahawks. . . . Next day the council proceeded with all the circumstance of a savage ceremonial. Clark tossed among them a bloody war belt defying the multitude. Dragging part of his chained captives into the ring, he contemptuously set them free, shouting that he scorned them all." This description is quite irreconcilable with the sources, which give no evidence of any such athletic and vociferous exhibition on the part of Clark.

It is certainly too much to say that "from the time of Clark, there has been no question as to our mastery over the Northwest throughout its whole extent." There was decidedly such a question through the period of the Confederation, and, indeed, in the War of 1812, so far as portions of the region are concerned. But it is in the matter of omissions that the most serious defects of the book are to be noted. Dr. Hosmer fails to give any adequate account of the diplomatic history of the Mississippi valley in the period of Washington and Adams, when the fate of the valley trembled in the balance. In that critical period, France made determined efforts to secure the control of that region, England likewise cast her eyes upon the river, and the mouth of the Mississippi was a pivotal point in the far-reaching schemes of Miranda, the South American revolutionist. Practically nothing of all this appears in the pages of Dr. Hosmer. Worse than this, two or three pages serve to cover the transition between the War of 1812 and the slavery struggle, and yet in the generation that occupied those years occurred some of the most important events in the history of the valley. Failing to describe the entrance of the New York, New England, and German elements into the northern half of the valley in the years prior to 1850, and failing adequately to portray the spread of cotton culture and the settlement of Southerners in the lower half of the valley in the same period, Dr. Hosmer loses the key to the development of that period. It was then that the Mississippi valley split in two, lines of transportation as well as social affinities bound the north together and the south together, and broke the unity of the valley. This great movement of population, and the

evolution of the social, economic and political life of the period are almost ignored by the author.

There is a similar defect in the treatment of the prairie portions of the valley since the war. Although this portion of the history of the region may not present such obviously picturesque features as the topics which he selects for consideration, and although these movements have not been worked out with the same care by preceding writers, nevertheless until these aspects of its history are duly considered, the Mississippi valley can certainly not be said to have received its historian.

F. J. T.

History of Intellectual Development: On the Lines of Modern Evolution. Vol. III., Political; Educational; Social; including an Attempted Reconstruction of the Politics of England, France and America for the Twentieth Century. By John Beattie Crozier. (New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1901, pp. xiv, 355.) This third volume of Crozier's now well-known *History*, written before the second because of failing eyesight and consequent fear for the future coupled with a predilection for practical conclusions, occupies itself first with the formulation of a general programme for the practical statesman and then with what are certainly interesting applications to the special politics of England, France and America. The book is stimulating in many ways, but the present notice must confine itself to only a word or two of possible criticism upon the general programme, which takes the form of four "rules of practical statesmanship" (pp. 149 ff.). Thus: (1) Preservation of National Type; (2) Consequent Dismissal of all merely Abstract Ideals; (3) Development of the State all along the line or "all of a piece," that is, without gaps or exclusions anywhere; and (4) Attention upon "*the material and social conditions*" rather than upon "*the character of the people*." All admirable rules assuredly, and they hold together strongly; the thoughtful statesman, the real statesman of the future would profit much from consideration of them, not to say from Mr. Crozier's latest volume from cover to cover. Nevertheless in what he urges Mr. Crozier himself only exemplifies the very abstract idealism that he so earnestly and so constantly decries—and this in our opinion without damaging the real value of the book at all. When we are told on one page that from the beginning statesmen have blindly followed abstract ideals and treated only useful means as if they were ends, this being nothing more nor less than a law of history, and then on another page that hereafter the statesman is to be practical only if independent of such a law, there appears to us what amounts almost to delightful *naïveté*. Practical politics do indeed need knowledge and understanding of history and Mr. Crozier offers the sort of reflection upon history that can but do good, but with the evidence of history itself and of certain well-known principles of psychology before us we can not see how human progress is ever going to cease to proceed, in the first place, through human devotion to abstract ideals and above all, in the second place, through the association and conflict of such ideals. One man has never yet been so

practical as to lead human society "all of a piece" and, if he had been, the rather important social element of society would have been materially if not fatally impaired. Individuals being by nature partial in their views and disposed to turn means into ends and consequently given to abstraction, all practical leadership must be a divided labor. Only the conflict of opposing abstractions has made and conserved human society and human history in the past, and we are still ready to believe that something of the kind will play its important part in the future. Certainly Mr. Crozier's ideal of a "practical statesman", however much worth his while and ours, is not saved from being abstract either by the term "practical" or by the subjection of practicality to the knowledge and understanding of history. Mr. Crozier seems to have missed the real meaning of the abstractions which he calls the illusions of history.

ALFRED H. LLOYD.

Die Äthiopische Königsinschrift des Berliner Museums. Regierungsbericht des Königs Nastesen des Gegners des Kambyzes; neu herausgegeben und erklärt von Heinrich Schaefer. Mit vier Luftdrucktafeln und einer Textabbildung. (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1901, pp. vii, 836.) This remarkable monument, inscribed with a long hieroglyphic inscription, was discovered by Graf Schlieffen in 1853 at New Dongola, and was published from a squeeze in the *Denkmäler* by Lepsius (1849-1859). The squeeze was imperfect and as the original stone did not arrive in Berlin until 1871, Lepsius had never seen the original monument when he published it. The above exhaustive and careful publication of the monument therefore fills a long felt want. As might have been expected, a close study of the original has brought out many important facts not before noted.

After showing that the monument originally belonged not in Dongola but in Napata, with the other five great royal stelæ brought from there by Mariette's men, the author takes up the age of the monument and shows conclusively that it belongs to a period beginning at about the entrance of the Persians into Egypt, having been erected in 517 B. C. It treats of the eight years immediately preceding that date and the author of the document, Nastesen, should be the King of Ethiopia, against whom Cambyzes's Ethiopian campaign was directed. In harmony with this conclusion, the new and important fact is brought out, that the inscription does mention the "coming" of a foe called K-m-b-s-w-d,¹ against whom Nastesen advances northward, putting him to flight, capturing some of his ships, his supplies, and his land. This harmonizes with Herodotus, the oldest classical source for this campaign of Cambyzes, who merely states that Cambyzes was obliged to turn back for lack of supplies and equipment. This would be a land division, which had left the river at Korusko; but of course the expedition must have been

¹ The name of Cambyzes is often written in hieroglyphic with a final *t*, a sibilant. In Nastesen's inscription an *n* and another uncertain sign follow the above writing. They are perhaps the remnant of a salutation following the royal name.

equipped with a fleet, and it is the fleet with which Nastesen meets, keeping to the river and evidently not coming into contact with the desert division of Cambyses's army at all. This is all carefully developed by the author (pp. 43-51), and in the opinion of the present writer, he makes good his case. The career of Nastesen as King of Ethiopia in early Persian times, as related in this inscription, forms an interesting commentary on that Ethiopian kingdom, which was known to the Greeks from Herodotus onward. The remarkable hybrid orthography of the inscription, which makes it difficult reading, as well as its grammar, is fully treated in a chapter which forms a valuable contribution to the subject. The historical questions are, however, treated in entire independence of the philological discussions, so that the work can be used by any historical student not familiar with the language; and it should be in every full historical library. On p. 119, correct "VIII. 13-16" to VI. 13-16.

JAMES HENRY BREASTED.

Source Book of the History of Education for the Greek and Roman Period. By Paul Monroe. (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1901, pp. xiii, 515.) This work represents an admirable conception fairly well executed. It consists of translations of the bulk of Greek and Roman educational literature and documents, with brief introductory and connective essays by the author. The execution is called only fair, not merely because the translations used are not always the best extant, nor because the author's own style suffers somewhat from scrappiness and repetition, nor even because "the interpretation is purposely left in large degree to the student"; but because the author's classicism impresses as being no more than moderate. Not that he is vulgarly ignorant, but that his discussions want that fulness, copiousness and subtle suggestiveness that mark not alone a superior style, but a completely intimate knowledge of the whole region of one's investigations. He does not, either, always march securely with the deeper underlying logic and inward conflict of ancient history; though in thin superficiality he seems to sin only once, namely when he is content to designate Xenophon's pedagogy as "The Historical View of Education" for apparently no other reason than that Xenophon is an historian. His unqualified acceptance, too, of Grote's view of the Sophists and Socrates would surely nowadays be reckoned as at least an inaccuracy of scholarly perspective. However, when all is said, and all these invidious deductions have been made, there remains in these essays a very great deal of valuable matter; while the book as a whole, bringing together as it does an entire body of source-materials, was most distinctly worth the doing.

GEORGE REBEC.

Vercingetorix. Par Camille Jullian. (Paris, Hachette, 1901, pp. 406.) A sympathetic and interesting monograph by a Bordeaux professor on this earliest national hero of the Gauls. The book begins with an account of the country of the Arverni, their religion, their people and their royal house, of which Vercingetorix is the most distinguished

member. It is written from the original sources, and the author follows Caesar closely in his description of the alliance of Vercingetorix with the Romans, then of the general uprising of the Gauls under Vercingetorix against the Roman oppressor, and of the military operations closing with the siege of Alesia and the capture of Vercingetorix. The concluding chapters describe the murder of the hero in the Roman prison at the foot of the Capitoline hill, on which Caesar was offering other sacrifices to Capitoline Jove, and give an account of the transformation of Gaul into a Roman province. The volume contains five reproductions of coins of Vercingetorix, seven maps and battle plans, with about forty pages of notes carefully discussing special points referred to in the text. While the work is written with due regard to the niceties of scholarship, it possesses also the characteristic French virtues of excellent form and charm of expression. One cannot help wishing that it were accessible to every American boy and teacher of boys to stimulate interest in this heroic Gaul and thus relieve somewhat the tedium of the study of Caesar's *Commentaries*.

JOSEPH H. DRAKE.

Muhammad and His Power. By P. De Lacy Johnstone. [The World's Epoch Makers.] (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901, pp. xviii, 238.) This little volume has the air, not uncommon in popular series, of being made to order. It is not ill done; it brings together the fruits of the best modern research in Islamic studies and it condenses the matter into the compass of a convenient and fairly readable book; it tries hard, moreover, to be impartial, but in this respect as well as in originality of statement or view it scarcely rises above mediocrity. In three preliminary chapters there is a good sketch of the tribal and intellectual life of Arabia before the Prophet. The body of the book is of course devoted to an account of Mohammed, the main features in whose career are familiar enough to be dismissed without much discussion. The author seems inclined to judge him by standards that ought not to pass without challenge. Certainly we may conclude from facts definitely known that he was a man of peace, simple, high-minded and loving. Possibly the very limitations in his intellect and education were causes of success. Had he known the intricacies of Jewish, Christian or Magian philosophies he would quite inevitably have soared above and beyond the capacity of his kinsmen and constructed something perhaps in the likeness of the Manichaean system to content a highly sophisticated age of theologians. Yet though its strength lay in its simplicity it was not the doctrine of Islam alone, however nicely adapted to do its work, that insured success to the movement; there was evidently something personal that affected the contemporaries of Mohammed almost magically. This it was which secured him such adherents as Ali and Abu Bakr and such enemies as his kinsmen of the Quraish; all who knew him appeared to understand that his triumph meant the end of the old order. A change does occur in the Prophet after the crisis of the hijera but he never became persecutor in preference to persuader. The purely material

energy displayed by his successors has been too generally imputed by his detractors to Mohammed himself. He urged them to the pitch of enthusiasm indeed by promises and rewards of superhuman value, but he was dealing with a backward and ferocious people whose energies he modulated to an extraordinary degree by enlisting them to united action for a holy cause. He was human, not divine. Fighting was forced upon him, but through the strife of his later years forcible conversion was no part of his aim nor did he ever refuse to forgive his foes if they consented to peace. The objection which may be reasonably urged against Mr. Johnstone's estimate of the great Arabian is that in common with most Christian historians he measures him by tests too severe. It shows a bias of creeds which has its source in defeats sustained at the hands of Mohammedans twelve centuries ago, of which it is time now to be a little ashamed. To say that Islam and its Prophet owed their success to the sword is to say that the wind creates the prairie fire.

F. W. WILLIAMS.

The Tower of London. By Lord Ronald Sutherland Gower. (London, Bell, 1902, two vols., pp. xii, 231; ix, 191.) In these two handsome volumes, beautifully illustrated with reproductions of old prints, engravings and etchings, the author relates the most important and dramatic events connected with the old fortress which was the scene of so much of the woe and pageantry of the English life for centuries. The first volume is taken up with the more notable occurrences until the death of Elizabeth, and with short sketches of the lives of the famous unwilling occupants of the place. The second volume comes down to the present time; the last important event mentioned is the attempt to blow up the Tower in January, 1885. One need not expect too accurate and painstaking statements in a volume that desires to be picturesque. For example, the reader will not find the same judicious treatment of Raleigh's imprisonment and execution as is found in the pages of Gardiner. Quotations from Pepys's Diary do not agree with the same passages in the best editions of that immortal compendium of entertaining gossip. There are, moreover, slight inaccuracies of statement; Laud's death did not occur in 1644, but in 1645; Raleigh did not leave England on his famous Guiana expedition at the end of March, but in June. Probably the general reader, for whom these interesting volumes are intended will not find their perusal saddened by occasional slips of this sort.

Wales. By Owen M. Edwards. [Story of the Nations Series.] (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1902, pp. xvi, 422.) The purpose and scope of Mr. Edwards's volume may be inferred from the fact that it belongs to the series of the "Story of the Nations." In some four hundred pages the author sketches the course of Welsh history from its beginning down to the present age. He does not seek to make new contributions to science but rather to set forth in clear and attractive form what is generally known of the subject. This purpose is achieved with fair, though not notable, success.

Mr. Edwards's account is trustworthy in the main. Unlike many earlier writers on Wales, he observes the limitations of historical knowledge and tries to discriminate between facts and unattested traditions. In his account, therefore, one misses with satisfaction the extravagant fancies which so long passed current with the Neo-druidical writers, and which have not yet disappeared from some text-books and encyclopædias. In what Mr. Edwards himself calls the "first attempt at writing a continuous popular history of Wales," this quality deserves praise. Throughout the book, in fact, an attempt is made to avoid disputed questions and keep the narrative in the beaten path.

A kind of superficiality, often bordering upon inaccuracy, was perhaps inevitable in a work of the sort. The fault is most apparent in the earliest chapters where the treatment is very cursory, and where the author is sometimes too ready with his generalizations. The beginnings of Christianity in Britain, for example, are passed over as if they did not present any difficult problems. The estimate of the extent of Christianity in the Roman period is certainly greater than would be borne out by recent discussion; and the statement that heathenism still held sway over the Goidelic inhabitants of Wales in the middle of the sixth century (p. 28) needs some substantiation. (The last opinion differs strikingly from the doctrine—also hazardous enough, to be sure—which Mr. Willis Bund set forth in his treatise, *The Celtic Church in Wales*, Chapter III.) Again in a later chapter (p. 235), the casual mention of Edward I. and of his relations with the bards is rather misleading. Finally Mr. Edwards has a tendency to idealize his favorite characters and perhaps to exaggerate a little the importance of their work. But on the whole his book will not be found to give a seriously erroneous impression of the course of Welsh history.

The narrative is for the most part clear and readable, though the opening chapters in this respect also are inferior to the later ones. The events of the earlier centuries were disorderly enough at best, and Mr. Edwards's somewhat disjointed style does not make them less confusing. From the time of Owen Gwynedd, however general principles are more clearly discerned and more effectively expounded.

The very modern period, like the most ancient, is passed over with scanty discussion. In fact the perspective of the book is open to considerable criticism. Very slight attention is paid to religious history, and the development of Welsh literature might well have received fuller treatment because of its bearing upon the national life.

The book would have been more useful to the student, and no less so to the general reader, if Mr. Edwards had not contented himself with a vague citation of authorities in his preface. Brief lists of sources, such as he has given at the ends of chapters in his *Hanes Cymru* (a text-book on Welsh history intended for use in the Principality), would not have been at all out of place.

F. N. ROBINSON.

Les Institutions Communales de Rome sous la Papauté. Par E. Rodocanachi. (Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1901, pp. vii, 424.) The present book is not M. Rodocanachi's first; since 1888 he has published at least ten or a dozen works, some of them of considerable size and importance. The book before us, as its title indicates, is a history of the communal institutions of Rome under the papacy. In treating the subject, the author has adopted the chronological method, beginning his story with the days when Rome was still governed by the imperial prefects and concluding it with the end of all communal institutions in the eighteenth century.

To the text of the book has been added an appendix containing two bulls: one of Pius II., dated October, 1460, and one of Sixtus V., dated May, 1588. Why these two documents were selected is hard to determine; they seem to add no special illumination to the text. Following the appendix comes an elaborate table of all the important bulls which relate to the communal life of the city between the years 1188 and 1595. Finally, the book contains a synoptical table of the articles of the four different codifications of the Roman municipal statutes.

In writing the book, the author, as he himself says, has endeavored to keep constantly before the reader the fact that the antagonism which existed from the earliest times between the papal power and the people determined the character of Roman institutions; that institutions were created as much to frustrate the will of the Pope as to insure the people in their liberties. Furthermore, the Roman people of the Middle Ages were so dominated by the traditions of the ancient glories of their city that many of their institutions were the result of a sort of brooding upon what the city had once been to the world. Yet the liberties which the Roman people succeeded from time to time in wresting from the Popes, they speedily lost; for there existed in the city none of that spirit of freedom which commercial activity had engendered in the minds of the citizens of the communes of northern Italy. Rome never was and never became a commercial city and therefore its communal institutions never had any very great vitality.

All these points are brought out very well in the book before us, but one notable weakness mars this otherwise satisfactory treatise. A close study of the communal institutions of Rome shows that they are almost all copies of the institutions of the cities of northern Italy. In almost every case, Rome was at least half a century behind the cities of Lombardy in its communal history and frequent reference to the institutions of the northern communes would therefore have helped the reader to understand much more easily the municipal history of Rome. Instead of doing this the author has treated all the Roman institutions as though they had their origin in the city itself and the book therefore suffers very much from the narrowness of the writer's point of view.

ARTHUR MAYER WOLFSON.

Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell, by Lucien Wolf (London, Macmillan and Co., 1901, pp. lxxxviii, 191), is a reprint in facsimile of three pamphlets published by Menasseh ben Israel in 1649-1656 to promote the readmission of the Jews into England, with an introduction and notes by the editor, and three portraits, two of which are from the hand of Rembrandt. It is a beautiful volume and appears under the auspices of the Jewish Historical Society of England as a memorial of the interesting character whose name it bears. Menasseh ben Israel was a rabbi living in Amsterdam, of Marrano descent, who was led by his studies of the Messianic prophecies and by the philo-Jewish character of the Puritan revolution to undertake a mission to Cromwell in 1655-1657 in the hope of securing a refuge for his persecuted co-religionists of the continent. The mission seemed at the time to be a failure owing to the opposition of the ministers and merchants, especially the latter, and Menasseh died of a broken heart; yet its ultimate result was the legal readmission of the Jews into England. In the heated debates on the question, two judges gave it as their opinion that there was no law prohibiting the residence of Jews in England, and Cromwell acted quietly on their advice. The pamphlets here reprinted are essential to a knowledge of this important episode.

Not the least valuable part of the volume is the introduction by Mr. Wolf giving a short history of the movement for readmission. For many years Mr. Wolf has contributed articles to historical periodicals on various phases of this topic. He has made the subject specially his own and his enthusiasm is clearly reflected in his interesting pages. One notices, however, that his natural desire to make the most of the somewhat fragmentary material leads him occasionally to outrun his evidence. Not to mention minor matters, it is certainly an exaggeration to regard Cromwell as the mainspring of the whole readmission movement and even the instigator of Menasseh's mission. Cromwell supported the mission heartily, but the documents hardly bear out the assertion that "Menasseh was but a puppet in his hands." It must be added, however, that the author cites his evidence constantly, which makes it easy for the careful reader to part company with him at any point. Whether he has not unduly emphasized the commercial side of Cromwell's policy, touches upon a question concerning which there is still disagreement. Mr. Wolf announces a new volume dealing with the same subject in greater detail, which will be looked forward to with interest. Of the general importance of this very creditable memorial volume, it is sufficient to say that it should not be overlooked by anyone who is interested in the history of the Commonwealth period, the history of the Jews, or the history of religious toleration.

G. J.

The Siege of Quebec and the Battle of the Plains of Abraham. By Arthur G. Doughty, in collaboration with G. W. Parmelee. (Quebec, Dussault and Proulx, 1901, six vols., pp. xxx, 280; x, 317; x, 340; xiii, 334; xi, 362; 346.) For several years past, there has been waged

in Quebec a controversy, at times heated, over the site of Wolfe's operations upon the Plains of Abraham and of his victorious death. The Wolfe monument undoubtedly springs from the death-spot; but whether that was at the front or the rear of the English army, has been the question. Some French authorities have contended that it was at the front, and that the monument consequently marks the utmost advance of the British before they were met by Montcalm's forces sallying from the fortress. Were this true, then some of the fighting must have taken place upon the present race-course lying immediately to the west of the monument, which enterprising guides exhibit to summer tourists as the veritable Plains of Abraham. On the other hand, English local antiquarians have as a rule stoutly claimed that Wolfe's men had advanced to a point much nearer the city's walls, and that the site of the battle is now largely occupied by private residences and a jail. As there has been on foot a project to sell the race-course to the city as a public park, it will be seen that not only racial but real estate interests have given spice to the discussion. Dr. Doughty, who is one of the librarians of the Quebec parliamentary library, and strongly possessed of the historical spirit, set out to discover the truth. His investigations led him far afield, until the task has broadened into these six portly volumes. He discovered that the race-course now shown as one of the sights of Quebec was not even a part of the Plains of Abraham, and that in all essentials the English side of the controversy is beyond question. However, this conclusion proves to be but incidental to the monumental work before us. Our author has given herein an excellent historical review of the circumstances leading up to the siege, together with a fresh account of every phase of the siege itself, and detailed biographies of Montcalm and Wolfe. These, he has conclusively fortified with a large collection of contemporary portraits and views, and manuscript plans, reports, journals, and miscellaneous documents of many kinds, in both French and English, industriously collected from scores of American and European archives, and all thoroughly annotated and indexed. It would seem to the casual reader as though the subject had been quite exhaustively treated in this respect; yet we are assured by the compiler that, so large is the mass of material, only selections from the sources have proved practicable, enough remaining unpublished to fill many more volumes—in case any future gleaner cares to prepare and publish them—to “shed additional light on the characters of the principal actors in the drama of 1759.” Students desiring to know the true inwardness of this far-reaching event in American history, must inevitably hereafter turn first to Dr. Doughty's scholarly and well-considered volumes; for Parkman's account, in *Montcalm and Wolfe*, is in comparison but a hasty summary. The volumes are handsomely printed, and the hundreds of illustrations reproduced by the most approved methods.

R. G. T.

Frederick the Great on Kingcraft, by Sir J. William Whittall (Longmans), gives text and translation of the famous *Matinées du Roi de Prusse* from what purports to be the original manuscript. That the writing is a

forgery is perfectly clear to anyone who has made even a superficial study of Frederick's reign—which Whittall has not done. To take a single point: Frederick is made to declare that, after laboring for several years and doubling the size of his army, he began to study his claims to Silesia and then began his war with Maria Theresa,—when we know for certain that within a few months after his accession his army was on the march. Again, how could Frederick, ostensibly in 1764, when he was still chafing under England's abandonment of him, have possibly given the advice to his heir: *La seule façon de rétablir vos affaires, c'est de vous conserver l'alliance de l'Angleterre!* Whittall claims that his manuscript is a copy of one that the Duc de Rovigo stole from the writing-table in Frederick the Great's library in Sans Souci in 1806, the copy having been given, in 1816, as a great mark of confidence to Whittall's grandfather, with stern injunctions not to publish it as long as either of them lived. But surely the successors of Frederick the Great would not have left a document so damaging to his reputation lying on his library table! Moreover Carlyle—to whom Whittall so scornfully alludes—in a copy of his history dated 1865, speaks of the Rovigo theory as completely exploded and states that he himself has been offered at least three "priceless manuscripts" of the *Matinées*. There is neither novelty nor merit in Whittall's "disclosures," though he naïvely assures us that during a period of well-nigh sixty years his grandfather was never accused of any "deviation from perfect truthfulness."

Mr. Hiram Brigham, Jr. has prepared for the press and published an attractive little pamphlet called *Five Straws Gathered from Revolutionary Fields* (Cambridge, 1901). The straws are letters written by William Weeks, a New Hampshire soldier in the Revolution, and they well deserved printing. Two are from Valley Forge, describing simply the privations of the soldiers. "Since my last" he writes April 30, "I have had the *Honour* of having the *small Pox* by way of *Innoculation* and so favourable that I scarcely expect to have a Receipt for it."

The French Revolution and Modern French Socialism. A Comparative Study of the Principles of the French Revolution and the Doctrines of Modern French Socialism. By Jessica Piexotto. (New York, Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1901, pp. viii, 409.) The author of this book has undertaken to present and compare the principles of that party in France which stood in sharpest opposition to the social order in existence at the close of the eighteenth century and of the one that stands in the same relation to the social order of the closing nineteenth century. She regards the men of 1793 as the real French Revolutionists, the real Irreconcilables, as the Socialists are to-day. The book falls into two parts, in each of which the treatment is the same: first a study of the writings of the leaders of the two schools, then an examination of the evolution of these theories into party programmes and of the modifications wrought in them during the process by reason of the national character, institutions and policies of the French, ending with an exposi-

tion and analysis of the doctrines in their completed form. In the closing chapter the principles of the two schools are compared, similarities and dissimilarities being pointed out. No attempt is made to show any historical connection between the modern Socialists and the early Revolutionists. The author expressly states that there was no conscious socialism in the Revolution at any rate before 1795. "To set about an inquiry concerning the socialism of the Revolution would be then . . . to undertake a superfluous task." She attempted simply to state and compare the doctrines of the two groups, their theories of the State, of the rights of man, the nature of property, the relations of individuals toward each other and toward the body politic. She correctly judges that such a study is worth while.

The book shows evidence of wide reading but a reading sometimes imperfectly mastered. It is fair and temperate but is written in a style so defective that it is frequently difficult to seize the precise meaning. The proof-reader or the printer is responsible for numerous mistakes. We have a plural noun with a singular verb on p. 79, "as" for "ask" on p. 229, words run together, p. 231, lines transferred, p. 226. Sévigny should read Sévigné (p. 90), Sièyes should read Sieyès (p. 132).

It would be difficult to show that the "reign of terror resulted from the principles of revolution" (p. 148); more difficult still to prove that "Mirabeau's strong statesmanship fairly dominated" the Constituent Assembly even against its will, as is stated on p. 112. The book contains valuable bibliographies and excellent indexes.

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

Eastern Problems at the Close of the Eighteenth Century. By Alfred L. P. Dennis. (Cambridge, Mass., The University Press, 1901, pp. 277.) The book before us was presented as a thesis for the degree of doctor of philosophy at Columbia University. The object of the thesis is to show the influence exerted by the Eastern Question during the period of the Revolution and of Napoleon. In his preface the author tells us that the three chapters of which the thesis consists form the preliminary chapters of a work which he has in preparation. The first chapter deals with the part played by the colonial questions in bringing about the rupture between England and France in 1793. While the war was nominally over the French invasion of Dutch territory, apparently a strictly European motive, yet on both sides Dutch sea power and colonial posts had come to be regarded as weapons in the rivalry for colonial dominion. As early as 1787 Mr. Pitt had written to Lord Cornwallis, then governor general in India, that "in this situation the first struggle will actually be for the dependencies of the Dutch Republic, and if at the outset of a war we could get possession of the Cape and Trincomale, it would go further than anything else to decide the fate of the contest." In support of his view as to the influence of the colonial question, the author makes a very interesting study of the trade interests in-

volved and of the views that prevailed in both countries in regard to the question of colonies.

The second chapter, entitled "The Eastern Question and the Revolution," discusses the problem of Asia, and prepares the way for the concluding chapter dealing with "Napoleon Bonaparte and the Orient." Attention may be called particularly to the interesting pages in which the author brings out the fact that, for some time back, expansion in the Mediterranean basin had been regarded as a French interest. Choiseul had suggested the occupation of Egypt to Louis XV. as compensation for the losses sustained by France in the Seven Years' War. In a despatch bearing date 1789, Saint-Priest, French ambassador at Constantinople, set forth that in case the Ottoman Empire should fall asunder, the fertility of Egypt, the ease with which it could be conquered and defended, and its command of the route to India, pointed that country out as the share of the booty which should fall to France. The author has enriched his pages by a thorough study of sources and has given us a monograph at once informing and suggestive. The bibliography covers fifty pages.

RICHARD HUDSON.

American Political History, to the Death of Lincoln, Popularly Told. By Viola A. Conklin. (New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1901, pp. 435.) No pretense is made that this book fills a long felt want. On the contrary it was avowedly created on the spur of the moment, to meet a newly felt want. A cultured New York woman had attended parlor lectures on art, music, the drama, etc., and had remained lamentably ignorant of the history of our own country. She called upon the author of this work to prepare a course of lectures on the political history of the United States, promising an audience of women equally ill-informed with herself and equally anxious to learn. The interest aroused in the lectures suggested their publication in more permanent form.

Viewed from the standpoint of origin and intention the work is highly meritorious. The pages are packed full of carefully selected information. The author shows a good deal of ability in seizing upon the salient points of periods and weaving them into a connected narrative. The narrative begins with the "Old Dominion," and is made continuous to the death of Lincoln. Of course, under such limitations the greater part of our political history is left out, yet it is remarkable how much is taken and put in such form as to hold the interest of the reader. Fifteen of the twenty-two chapters are devoted to the history of the presidential administrations beginning with that of Washington. The book abounds in apt quotations. A good many of these are woven into the narrative without any intimation of the source from which they are drawn. There is no bibliography, and there are scarcely any footnotes. It was the evident intention of the author to give the information required without troubling any one with supplemental reading. The narrative moves along, for the most part, in chronological order, and at the top of each page there is a date which is intended to mark the lead-

ing event noticed on the page; but in some instances several events belonging to different years are noted on the same page in such a manner as to confuse the unwary reader. At page 222, date 1817, the author drops back to date 1792 and devotes two pages to Eli Whitney and the genesis of the cotton gin.

There are many little touches which add interest to the narrative. Apropos of the extraordinary affection which the followers of Clay felt for their leader we are informed that he found upon visiting his banker that his debts had been paid and his notes and mortgages cancelled by money sent for that purpose by anonymous admirers. Jackson's "Kitchen Cabinet" receives as much attention as his war with the bank.

JESSE MACY.

Early Settlers and Indian Fighters of Southwest Texas by A. J. Sowell (Austin, Texas, Ben C. Jones and Co., 1900, pp. viii, 844) purports to be a recital of facts gathered from survivors of pioneer days, recounting the deeds of the men "who cut the brush and blazed the way for emigration" and bore the burden of western expansion in the heat of the day. One cannot help feeling that these stories, the truth of which cannot possibly be ascertained by a reviewer, must be taken with many generous allowances of salt. The modern historical student has learned that the best evidence is not always the testimony of an eye-witness, even when he was himself *magna pars* of what he tells. But nevertheless these tales of privation and border conflict, if they be, as the skeptic thinks, untrustworthy in detail, are well worth preserving, and possibly not without their value to the critical writer of history.

The Growth of the Empire, A Handbook to the History of Greater Britain. By Arthur W. Jose. (London, John Murray, 1901, pp. xvi, 422.) The first edition of Mr. Jose's book, printed in Melbourne nearly thirty-five years ago was almost unknown beyond the boundaries of Australia and now this very much enlarged edition is published simultaneously in London and Melbourne. This fact is an indication of the political change which has taken place in the peoples of the British Empire. The seed which Professor Seeley sowed has nowhere taken deeper root than in the Australian continent and Mr. Jose, his ardent disciple, has traced its growth and present condition in this last edition of his admirable summary. His historic instinct shows him that Australia was won at Trafalgar and that both to Britain and the United States the Napoleonic wars afforded opportunities for growth which they were slow to seize, but which in time proved their claim to be the most successful colonizers of the world. Mr. Jose is a fair representative of the Australian historians, adding to his knowledge of Seeley and Mahan the advantages of sufficient remoteness from the English-speaking countries of Europe and America to view both from a standpoint which is interesting and novel. He sees that the British Empire is the most complex in the world, that it is no formal union of self-governing and crown-governed countries, but a union of peoples drawn by common sentiment round the

mother-land and that, therefore, those who would unduly hasten an Imperial Federation are endangering the future by impetuosity. The summaries of the histories of India and Australia are succinct and fairly accurate; those of Canada and the American colonies are not quite equal to them and are disfigured by a few geographical mistakes which should be corrected in the next edition. The outline maps showing the successive stages of development though small are admirably suited for a textbook. No better book can be placed in the hands of anyone desirous of knowing what the British Empire is, and how it came into existence.

JAMES BAIN.

Life of Sir William Wilson Hunter, K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D. By Francis Henry Skrine, F.S.S. (London and New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1901, pp. xvi, 496, xxxii.) Sir William Hunter had extensive rather than thorough knowledge of India. He was a literary executive and had a rare capacity for seeing beyond the facts. He could take a long view, could plan a set of encyclopædic volumes and could set his assistants to work collecting the facts while he, by means of a preface or a newspaper article, gave to the average man a stimulating and suggestive idea regarding the general truth. His lucidity and his capacity for understanding what people in England wished to know and ought to know were undoubtedly due in part to his long newspaper career. He popularized India to England and this without loss of dignity; to an ever increasing extent he was the spokesman of India to the English world. The *Gazetteer* will probably give him his ultimate fame, for in spite of his laboriousness and his style Hunter was better as an editor or compiler than as an historical student. To hope for great accuracy or for the spirit of the scholar in such a man was to wish for a different, though perhaps not a greater, sort of an historian. Mr. Skrine in the biography hints at this. Sir William Hunter in his letters and writings makes it clearer. Yet Hunter's work is so valuable and stands in such small need of adjectives, and he himself was so much of a man that it is a matter of regret that his biographer has seen fit almost to bury him and his achievements beneath a mass of exaggeration and exuberancy. There is little about Hunter that is not "consummate" to Mr. Skrine. This trick of excess is one to which Hunter himself was liable as for example when he writes that recently he examined "the whole body of modern Indian literature." Where it is of small moment in so great a man as Hunter it is at least disappointing in his biographer. Hunter's literary career is not well treated and the fact that meaningless pictures of the library and drawing room at Oaken Holt are reproduced in the work is significant. Mr. Skrine fails to give satisfactory answers to such questions as these—how real was Hunter's editorship in many of his complicated literary ventures, to what extent did he depend on his assistants, how many oriental languages could he use as tools, did he as Mr. Skrine seems to indicate spend only a few days at Lisbon working among the Portuguese documents which were to be used in the first volume of the *History of British India*? The literary and political man is sacrificed to the social

man. Mr. Skrine might revise his proofs and might spell "Mahammadan" differently, and certain foot-notes, particularly those on pp. 10 and 31, dealing with Chinese matters, require attention. He believes that the *Annals of Rural Bengal* "astonished the World" and influenced Mr. J. R. Green in making his plan for the *Short History of the English People*. There is no mention of such an influence in Mr. Greene's *Letters*. A bibliography of Hunter's works is given at the end of the book. It is a remarkable output for a man who was also an Indian official and journalist and who found time to enjoy life, though in spite of great physical disabilities.

A. L. P. D.

Like the previous volumes in the series, *The Review of Historical Publications relating to Canada for the Year 1901* edited by Professor George M. Wrong and H. H. Langton (Toronto, 1902, pp. 236) is a valuable and helpful compendium. It would be worth while to collect titles of the books in this field even if the reviews were not critical or exhaustive. As a matter of fact, however, the comments seem exceptionally good, and on the whole scholarly and sound. Many books are included in the list, that would not at first sight seem to be in the Canadian field, but the intention of the editors seems to be to make the list exhaustive and to include all books that materially touch upon Canadian history and interests. For example, the books that appeared during the year on the Marcus Whitman controversy are here briefly reviewed, the writer reaching the conclusion that the evidence which induced Professor Bourne to form his opinion of the mythical character of the story is sufficient "to convince anybody open to conviction." It may be incidentally noted that the writer of the review in question is wrong in saying that Whitman was "voted a niche in the Hall of Fame." The collection includes notices of magazine articles as well as books.

The *Report on Canadian Archives* for 1901 by Douglas Brymner, archivist (Sessional Paper No. 18, for 1902), contains calendars of the state papers of Lower Canada from 1836 to 1857, and of the state papers of Upper Canada for 1836. The material relates in part to a somewhat critical and important period, throwing light on the history of the rebellion of 1837 as well as on other matters not uninteresting to the student of Canadian history. Since the last report was published 64 volumes of copies of state papers have been received from London, containing among other things Admiralty papers, 1812 to 1815; Dartmouth papers, 1759 to 1784; minutes of executive council, 1753 to 1785. From Paris have come 24 volumes relating to Ile Royale, Missions, Ile St. Jean and Prise de Louisbourg.

History for Ready Reference. By J. N. Larned (revised and enlarged edition in 6 volumes). Vol. VI. Recent History (1894-1895 to 1901) A to Z. (Springfield, Mass., The C. A. Nichols Co., 1901, pp. 720.) We are already familiar with the plan and scope of the previous volumes in this set; this one differs materially from its predecessors in that it is for the

most part a collection of extracts from official despatches and publications. Instead of being a summary of the views of various writers of subjects which are under investigation by students it is largely a reprint of the original sources of contemporary political history. As such it has a distinct and unique value. For example the article on Cuba is with two exceptions (a short extract from Latané, *Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish America*, and one from an article by Fitzhugh Lee in the *Contemporary Review* for June, 1898) composed practically of quotations from United States government publications. Nine-tenths of the article on the United States is similar in character. In dealing with international matters with which the United States had no immediate concern or where no adequate reports by United States officials exist the editor has relied for official documents almost entirely on British Blue Books. No extended attempt has been made to translate from French or German documents. The entire history of the Spanish-American war with the exception of a short summary of Admiral Cervera's report as "partly published in newspapers at Madrid" and republished by Secretary Long is compiled from United States government reports and a few extracts from Marshall, *The Story of the Rough Riders*, Bonsal, *The Fight for Santiago*, and similar books. The general causes of the war in South Africa and the fundamental differences between Great Britain and the Transvaal are treated in extracts from a number of books and magazine articles which may or may not seem to be impartial to the reader. The record of events is contained in British government publications. Occasionally the editor permits himself to express an opinion as in condemning vigorously the failure of the Senate to ratify the arbitration treaty with Great Britain. Such is the general character of the book. As a collection of what must be original sources it has great value to the student; as a summary of recent politics it is a most convenient volume; but it is not a means of securing information through other than English or American documents, books, magazines and newspapers. It would be possible to complain that such and such a topic has been omitted or inadequately treated, but on the whole the arrangement is good and an elaborate scheme of cross references adds materially to the usefulness of the book. A dozen maps and as many statistical tables are scattered through the volume.

A. L. P. D.

Municipal Administration. By John A. Fairlie. (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1901, pp. xiv, 448.) This is a book of considerable merit. The author presents a comprehensive view of the problems of municipal government, and of the manner in which their solution has been undertaken in the United States and in the principal countries of Europe. A great mass of material is brought together, and the selection and grouping of data is on the whole admirable. The book is divided into four parts: Municipal History, Municipal Activities, Municipal Finances, and Municipal Organization. Of the historical part, the chapter on medieval cities is the least satisfactory, but it must be admitted that it

is hardly possible to give a clear account of so complex a subject in the brief space of a dozen pages. We should not expect to find in a treatise of this character a full discussion of the legal aspect of municipal corporations; but the brief statement of legal principles in the chapter on the council does not show a perfect grasp of the law, and will be of comparatively little value to the student. It would have been better if the author had attempted to set forth, in treating of the various municipal functions and powers, the legal problems and difficulties arising in connection with them. This would have been of distinct value; for the layman cannot be expected to study legal treatises, and a proper understanding of many important municipal problems is greatly aided by some knowledge of judicial decisions, so in the matter of the regulation of rates, power over franchises, contracting of loans and issue of bonds. So, in the chapter on organization, the creation of a number of distinct municipalities out of substantially the same territory and population, with its effect upon limit of indebtedness and budget, would have deserved more attention than it has received.

The main portion of the work, treating of municipal activities, is, however, on the whole, extremely satisfactory. It covers the following subjects: health and safety; charities and provident institutions; education; and municipal improvements under two subdivisions: those dedicated to public uses without charge, and those for the use of which a charge is made, and which are largely owned and managed by private corporations. The progress and present status of administration in these matters is illustrated by an abundance of material, well digested and lucidly arranged. As a handbook for the use of the growing number of persons, who wish to inform themselves upon the problems and principles of municipal government, the treatise is so far without a rival in American literature.

ERNST FREUND.

Two Centuries of Growth of American Law, 1701-1901. By Members of the Faculty of Yale Law School. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901, pp. xviii, 538). This is one of the Yale Bicentennial Publications, a series of volumes "issued in connection with the Bicentennial anniversary as a partial indication of the character of the studies in which the University teachers are engaged." It is made up of a series of articles, seventeen in number, upon the leading topics of law, prepared by the members of the law faculty of Yale University.

To write within the compass of 500 pages an adequate history of the development of American law during the past two centuries is obviously impossible. Even if it were attempted, the arbitrary division of the subject under seventeen separate heads, each of which is to be independently treated, must result in much repetition and lack of coherence. The mere statement of the conditions imposed will show what the limitations are. Professor Rogers, for example, for the great subject of municipal corporations, is allotted but sixty pages, while the still greater subject of private corporations is covered by Judge Baldwin in fifty. The articles

therefore must be, as their authors have described them, merely outline sketches. They are too brief and too general to be of great value to the lawyer, though they undoubtedly contain facts with which many practising lawyers are unfamiliar. They will, however, give the general reader an excellent idea of the growth and present condition of the main topics of the law. They cannot be regarded as serious history, but they do admirably serve the less ambitious purpose for which they were designed.

FLOYD R. MECHEM.

NOTES AND NEWS

The tragic death of Paul Leicester Ford is felt as a serious loss to American historical writing especially in the lines of bibliography. Mr. Ford was born in Brooklyn, New York, in 1865 and from an early age showed a marked interest in genealogy and historical research. From 1884 to 1896 he produced a score of bibliographies mainly relating to the period of the Revolution and the Confederation. Recently his interest in this direction led to his founding *The Bibliographer*, of which he was editor at the time of his death. He had previously been associate editor of the *Library Journal* and secretary of the New York Library Club. Another phase of his activity lay in editing historical material. He edited, among other things, the *Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, the *Works of John Dickinson*, *Pamphlets on the Constitution, 1787-1788*, *Essays on The Constitution*, and *The Federalist*. He contributed two biographies, *The True George Washington*, 1896, and *The Many Sided Franklin*, 1899. The cause of American historical research has the greater reason to deplore his loss in that it has come at a time when years of scholarly training such as few men of his age are fortunate enough to have gone through, together with his known literary skill, seemed to have qualified him for constructive historical work of the first rank.

The list of historical scholars that have died recently includes the names of Léonce Couture, director of the *Revue de Gascogne* since 1863 and an extensive writer on local subjects; Jules Girard, known especially by his work on the intellectual and moral history of the Greeks; Max Buedinger, professor in the University of Vienna, who devoted himself successively to ancient, medieval and modern, and universal history; and Charles Morel, teacher, editor, archæologist, and writer in matters pertaining to Roman and Genevan history.

Albert Gallatin Riddle died in Washington on May 15. He was born in Massachusetts in 1816. Most of his life was spent in Ohio where he took an active part in Free Soil politics in the Western Reserve, being a member of Congress during the Civil War. Besides sundry magazine articles on historical subjects, he wrote a *Biography of Benjamin F. Wade*, 1886, and an entertaining volume on *Recollections of War Times*, 1895.

The Johns Hopkins press has published a volume which will be of peculiar interest to the readers of the REVIEW. It is a tribute to the memory of Herbert B. Adams (Baltimore, 1902, pp. 160). It contains in addition to a sketch of his life and appreciations of his work and influence, a record of the publications of the graduates and contributing members of the department of history, politics and economics at Johns Hop-

[The department of Notes and News is under the general management of Earl W. Dow and Theodore C. Smith.]

kins, during the twenty-five years of its existence. The list is a monument, enduring and truth-telling.

The second number of the new *South Atlantic Quarterly* reasserts in its leading article the hope and purpose of giving expression to a genuine southern literary movement. So far the articles appear to be largely historical in character and as such are referred to elsewhere in this number of the REVIEW. It is to be observed that this periodical added to those already in existence will make the sixth now devoted to the history of the former slave states.

Professor H. P. Judson has resigned from the Board of Editors of the REVIEW, and the Board, acting under the special authority of the Council of the American Historical Association, has chosen Professor J. Franklin Jameson to fill his place until the next meeting of the Council.

Professor Dana C. Munro, of the University of Pennsylvania, goes to the University of Wisconsin the coming year as Professor of European History. Professor W. C. Abbott, of Dartmouth College, has accepted a similar position in the University of Kansas.

The Bibliographical Society of Chicago has issued a limited, handsomely printed edition of *On the Difficulty of Correct Description of Books*, by Augustus DeMorgan, which appeared originally in *Companion to the Almanac; or Year-book of general information for 1853*.

The Société des Études Historiques continues the publication of its *Bibliothèque de Bibliographies Critiques*. The three last fascicles we have received comprise a critical bibliography of *Épigraphie Latine*, by René Cagnat; a bibliography of *Hoffmann*, by Henri de Curzon; and a very complete as well as critical list of materials for the history of *Les Conflits entre la France et l'Empire pendant le Moyen Age*, by Alfred Leroux (Paris, Picard).

In the field of historical theory, attention may be directed to a series of articles by K. Breysig, in the *Zukunft* (XII, 15-17); "La Psychologie et l'Histoire," by A. D. Xénopol, in the *Compte Rendu* of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences (December, 1901); "La Méthode des Sciences Historiques," by Father Castelein, forming part of his *Logique* but published separately (Namur, Delvaux); and "The Economic Interpretation of History," by Professor Seligman, in the *Political Science Quarterly* (beginning in Vol. XVI., No. 4).

The well-known Putzger *Historischer Schul-Atlas* has lately appeared in a twenty-fifth jubilee edition, in which numerous improvements have been made. Particularly, the number of maps, including insets, has been increased from 139 to 234, while the price remains the same (New York, Lemcke and Buechner).

The appearance, though tardy, of Part XXVIII. of the *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe* again revives the hope that that work may soon be completed. This last fascicle includes "The Growth of Prussia," by C. Grant Robertson; "Italy, 1167-1250," by Miss Lina Eckenstein;

and, of special interest, "India under Mohammedan Rule" (two maps, one about 1340, the other for 1605), by Professor Lane-Poole.

Three reviews which will publish articles in the field of history have lately been founded at Paris: *Minerva*, devoted to letters and arts in general, appears twice a month; each number has one hundred and sixty pages and sells at two francs (Fontemoing). *Les Arts*, an illustrated monthly, at 22, 24 and 28 francs per year, will give especially reproductions of ancient and modern works (Manzi, Joyant et Cie). *La Revue Latine*, edited by Émile Faguet, will be occupied principally with comparative literature: 4 and 5 francs per year (Fromentin).

The fifth general table of the *Revue Historique*, covering the years 1896 to 1900 inclusively, has lately been distributed to the subscribers of 1901 and may be had by others at 3 francs. Its most serviceable parts, naturally, are the division of bibliography, which comprises this time 4,659 titles, and the "Répertoire Méthodique," where these titles are classified according to the place, time and subject to which they refer.

With the appearance of *The Moors*, Mr. Budgett Meakin's important trilogy on Morocco is completed. The first volume of the series, *The Moorish Empire*, is concerned mainly with the government and politics of Morocco, from the earliest times; the second, entitled *The Land of the Moors*, deals especially with the physical features of the country; and the third is occupied with the people of the country, socially, ethnologically and morally (London, Sonnenschein.)

In commemoration of the half-century Jubilee of the Owens College, which was celebrated at Manchester in March, twenty members of the College, including professors and former students, published, through Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co., a volume of *Historical Essays* which will hold an honorable place in "Festschrift" literature. All the articles set forth results of original investigation, save two in which Mrs. Alfred Haworth and Mr. Thomas Bateson treat of the teaching of history in elementary and secondary schools.

The International Congress for the Historical Sciences that was to be held in Rome last April failed to assemble, owing to intervention, after divers incidents, by the Ministry of Public Instruction in Italy. No doubt, however, much of the matter that would have been presented to the Congress will soon appear by other channels. MM. P. Caron and Ph. Sagnac, for example, will publish shortly their report on the present state of studies in France relating to modern and contemporary history.

A new Palæographical Society is in course of formation at London, to replace on larger bases the organization which was dissolved in 1895.

Professor Henry E. Bourne's *The Teaching of History and Civics in the Elementary and Secondary School* has just been published, by Longmans, Green and Co.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

A *Bibliographie der Alten Geschichte*, by A. B. Hettler, is announced to appear soon. It is devoted especially to works that have been published since 1861 (Grossenhain, Baumert and Ronge).

The bibliography of "Theological and Semitic Literature for the Year 1900," prepared by W. Muss-Arnolt for the *American Journal of Theology* and the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, has been issued separately. It forms a pamphlet of 108 pages (University of Chicago Press).

The *Revue Historique*, in the number for May and June, resumes its "Bulletin" of French publications relating to the history of Greece. M. Gustave Fougères takes up this service at the point where M. Paul Girard felt compelled to renounce it in 1892. In the same number, also, Dr. Ad. Bauer gives a third installment of his review of similar publications in Germany and Austria for the years 1898 to 1900.

A history of charity, to be completed in five volumes, is being published by MM. Picard: *Histoire de la Charité*, by Léon Lallemand. The first volume relates to antiquity; the second, which is in the press, is to cover the first nine centuries of the Christian era.

We have received a small book entitled *Lessons from Greek Pottery*, by Professor J. H. Huddilston, of the University of Maine. It "represents an attempt to arouse a more general interest in the study of the Greek vases," on the idea that Greek ceramic art reveals, in a direct and effective manner, Hellenic personality. The second part of the book is designed to be of assistance even to the specialist, being given to "A Bibliography of Greek Ceramics" (New York, The Macmillan Company).

M. Maurice Croiset continues, in the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for February, his review of work upon Greek literature, dealing this time with the drama, history and oratory.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. H. Howorth, *The Later Rulers of Shurpula or Lagash*, Part II. (*English Historical Review*, April); Gaston Boissier, *Les Opinions politiques de Tacite* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, March 15); Paul Allard, *La Religion de l'Empereur Julien* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, April); N. Vaschide and H. Piéron, *La Croyance à la Valeur Prophétique du Rêve dans l'Orient Antique* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, October, December and February).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

From a recent volume by C. Blume, S. J., *Repertorium Repertorii. Kritischer Wegweiser durch U. Chevalier's Repertorium Hymnologicum* (Leipzig, Reisland), it would appear that one should not venture to use Chevalier's hitherto much commended work without at least controlling it by the list of a thousand or so errors drawn up by Father Blume. It may be recalled in this connection that a supplement to Chevalier's work is now appearing in the *Analecta Bollandiana*.

Volume XVI. of the *Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris* is a contribution to early Byzantine history: "Constantin V, Empereur des Romains (740-745)," by A. Lombard, and with a preface by Ch. Diehl (Alcan).

The latest numbers, 134 and 135, of the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* are devoted respectively to "Les Marchands de l'Eau, Hanse Parisienne et Compagnie Française," by É. Picarda, and "La Diplomatie Carolingienne" from the treaty of Verdun to the death of Charles the Bald, by J. Calmette. This latter work especially recalls the labors and inspiration of the regretted Giry, as do also the articles, entitled "Étude sur les Lettres de Loup de Ferrières," now being published by another of his students, A. Levillain, in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*. It may also be noted here that the fifth volume of the memoirs and documents published by the Society of the School of Chartres is given to an *Examen critique des Chartes mérovingiennes et carolingiennes de l'Abbaye de Corbie*, by Léon Levillain (Paris, Picard).

The fourth number of Vol. XX. of the *Analecta Bollandiana* is devoted mainly to a catalogue of manuscripts of lives of the saints in the library of Douai: *Catalogus Codicum Hagiographicorum Latinorum Bibliothecae Publicae Duacensis*; and to twelve appendices to the same, in which some of the more important pieces are published.

M. Paul Sabatier has still farther signalized his devotion to the subject with which his name is most associated by founding an International Society for Franciscan Studies. This organization will have its seat at Assisi and will aim to provide a special library and to promote in other ways a systematic accumulation of knowledge upon St. Francis.

Apropos of the French translation of Mr. Lea's *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, M. Ch.-V. Langlois wrote for *La Grande Revue* (September, October, November, 1901) a short account of the Inquisition as it appears in the light of recent investigations. This account, remarkable for its clearness, is now issued in a small volume by the Société nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition: *L'Inquisition d'après des Travaux Récents* (Paris, G. Bellais).

A biography of John Huss, including a picture of the time in which he lived, is being prepared by Count Lützow and will be published by Messrs. Dent. It will probably be a two-volume work.

The number of reproductions of important manuscripts is notably enriched by the publication of the Dresden illustrated codex of the *Sachsenspiegel*: *Die Dresdener Bilderhandschrift des Sachsenspiegels*, edited by Karl von Amira. The facsimile, which is being issued in two parts, consists of one hundred and eighty-four phototypic plates, and there are also six plates in colors. Later on the editor will devote a separate volume to a detailed commentary setting forth the importance of the manuscript to the history of law (Leipzig, Hiersemann).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Maurice Dumoulin, *Le Gouvernement de Théodoric, d'après les Œuvres d'Ennodius*, concluded (*Revue*

Historique, March and May); Eduard Sachau, *Über den zweiten Chalifen Omar. Ein Charakterbild aus der ältesten Geschichte des Islams* (Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, March); Paulus de Loë, O. Pr., *De Vita et Scriptis B. Alberti Magni*, Part II. (Analecta Bollandiana, XX., 3); E. Beauvois, *La Chrétienté du Groenland au Moyen Age* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April).

MODERN HISTORY.

Changes of general interest are being made in the *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*. With the last number (March-April) of its third annual volume this journal ceased to appear as a bimonthly. A supplementary number will be issued in July and distributed gratis to subscribers. Then, beginning in October, ten numbers a year will be sent out, on the 15th of each month, omitting August and September. Each number will contain one or two short articles of a critical-bibliographical order, aiming to set forth the state of knowledge on subjects in modern history and questions in regard to them that still remain to be treated; and for the rest special emphasis will be placed upon reviews, analyses of periodicals, notes and news, and lists of new books. The subscription price remains the same: 18, 19 and 20 francs; but an extra charge (for subscribers, one half of the published price) will be made for all volumes of the *Répertoire Méthodique* after the one for 1900, which is now in press. This excellent bibliographical aid, moreover, is to be issued hereafter in two fascicles, one being devoted to the history of literature, art and the sciences.

Mr. R. W. Seton Watson, in his Stanhope Essay on *Maximilian I. Holy Roman Emperor*, lays special stress on the attitude of Maximilian toward the Humanists of the German Renaissance (London, Constable). Another side of Renaissance history is treated by Mr. Lewis Einstein, in *The Italian Renaissance in England* (New York, The Macmillan Company).

The Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania has lately issued *Select Colloquies of Erasmus*, which is the first of the four volumes of "Sixteenth Century Classics" promised by Professor Merrick Whitcomb.

The Oxford University Press has brought out the first volume of a *History of the Peninsular War*, by C. W. C. Oman. The work is not designed to supersede Napier, but rather to set forth in a trustworthy manner the political side of that war.

The *Mémoires du Lieutenant-Général de Suremain*, relating to Sweden in the time of the Republic and the First Empire, have been published at Paris, through MM. Plon-Nourrit et Cie.

Mr. Edward Dacey, in a recently published work entitled *The Story of the Khedivate*, has traced the successive stages in the process by which Egypt was converted into a dependency of Great Britain (London, Rivingtons).

The more noteworthy recent books relating to contemporary history and problems include *The Mastery of the Pacific*, by Archibald R. Colquhoun, and *All the Russias*, by Henry Norman (London, Heinemann). There is also a specially opportune work on Africa: *The Beginning of South African History*, by Dr. George McCall Theal, which sets forth the changes that took place there from the earliest times down to 1652 (Unwin).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Albert Hyrvoix, *Francois I^{er} et la première Guerre de Religion en Suisse (1529-1531)* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April); P. de Ségur, *Luxembourg et le Prince d'Orange* (Revue des Deux Mondes, April 1, 15, May 1); H. Hüffer, *Der Feldzug der Engländer und Russen in Holland im Herbst 1799 und die Stellung Preussens* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, April).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. have announced an important new *History of England*, on the co-operative plan, under the editorship of the Rev. William Hunt and Dr. R. L. Poole. One American scholar, Professor George B. Adams, is among the contributors. He will write the second volume, extending from 1066 to 1216. The other contributors and their periods are as follows: Vol. I., to 1066, by Mr. Hodgkin; Vol. III., 1216 to 1337, by T. F. Tout; Vol. IV., to 1485, by C. W. C. Oman; Vol. V., to 1547, by H. A. L. Fisher; Vol. VI., to 1603, by A. L. Smith; Vol. VII., to 1660, by F. C. Montague; Vol. VIII., to 1702, by R. Lodge; Vol. IX., to 1760, by I. S. Leadam; Vol. X., to 1801, by William Hunt; Vol. XI., to 1837, by the Warden of Merton; and Vol. XII., to 1901, by G. W. Prothero.

The first number of the *Ancestor* fulfils very satisfactorily the promise of an authoritative periodical of genealogy and family history and antiquities. The numerous contributions of Mr. Round to this first number lead us to anticipate the publication here of much that will be of value to the student of English history in the wider sense; and this is confirmed by the important article which is contributed by Sir George Sitwell on the early uses of the term "gentlemen" and the rise of the distinct social class known by that name. Of special interest to American families are the articles on "The Rise of the Fitzgeralds" and "The Grosvenor Myth," and the extracts on family history here brought together from the reports of the Manuscripts Commission. A department of queries is proposed. The first number is a finely printed and illustrated large octavo, bound in boards.

The Selden Society breaks new ground in Vol. XV. of its publications: *Select Pleas, Starks and Other Records from the Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, 1270-1284*, edited by J. M. Rigg, with an extensive introduction devoted to the history of the English Jewry until the expulsion. As is usual in the publications of this society, the text is accompanied by an English translation, and at the end of the volume are a glossary and indexes of subjects, persons and places. Also the Society announces, for

this year, the first volume of *Select Proceedings in the Star Chamber*, edited by I. S. Leadam; and for later years two volumes of *Year-Books of Edward II.*, edited by Professor Maitland.

The character, work and motives of Thomas Cromwell are treated by R. B. Merriman, an American student, in two volumes lately issued by the Clarendon Press: *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*.

In *The English Chronicle Play*, Professor Felix E. Schelling, of the department of English literature in the University of Pennsylvania, presents a study in the popular historical literature environing Shakespeare; he attempts to tell the history of one part of the Elizabethan drama. Shakespeare, naturally, forms the center of the study (New York, The Macmillan Company).

We have received from Mr. G. L. Beer a reprint of his articles on "Cromwell's Policy in its Economic Aspects," which appeared recently in the *Political Science Quarterly* (Vol. XVI., 4, and Vol. XVII., 1). They aim to set forth the part of Cromwell in furthering the expansion of England's commercial and colonial empire.

The "Popish plot" of 1678 has received a full treatment from Catholic hands in the work by Joseph Spellmann, S. J., entitled *Die Blutzengen aus den Tagen der Titus Oates-Verschwörung (1678-1681): ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte Englands in 17 Jahrhundert* (Freiburg i. B., Herder).

A History of the House of Douglas, 2 vols., by Sir Herbert Maxwell, is of interest not only in itself, but also for the fact that it is the first of a proposed series of histories of those families which have principally contributed to the development of Great Britain and Ireland (London, Freemantle and Co.).

The second volume of Professor P. Hume Brown's *History of Scotland* was issued recently, covering the period from the accession of Mary Stuart to the Revolution of 1689. This noteworthy work will be completed in a third volume, now in press (Cambridge University Press).

The history of the Scot abroad appears to be on the order of the day. We note especially: C. A. Hanna, *The Scotch Irish, or the Scot in North Britain, North Ireland and North America*, 2 vols. (Putnam's); and Th. A. Fischer, *The Scots in Germany* (Edinburgh, Schulze and Co.).

The *Quarterly Review* for April contains an excellent article on S. R. Gardiner and J. R. Green: "Two Oxford Historians." Mention may also be made of appreciations of Mr. Gardiner in the *English Historical Review* for April, by Professor Powell, and the *Athenæum* of March 1; and of an article in the *Edinburgh Review* for April, on Green and his work.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. B. Bury, *Tirechán's Memoir of St. Patrick* (*English Historical Review*, April); Eugène d'Eichthal, *Condition de la Classe Ouvrière en Angleterre (1828)*. *Notes prises par*

Gustave d' Eichtal (Revue Historique, May); R. Garnett, *The Authorship of Lord Durham's Canada Report* (English Historical Review, April).

FRANCE.

In *The Growth and Decline of the French Monarchy*, 2 vols., Dr. James Mackinnon traces the development of that institution until it reached its climax under Louis XIV., together with the effects of its exercise on the people; and then follows the process of decline, in order to elucidate the more immediate causes of the Revolution (New York, Longmans, Green and Co.).

An important contribution to general as well as local history is made by M. Charles de Lasteyrie in a monograph on one of the oldest and best known abbeys of France: *L'Abbaye de Saint-Martial de Limoges* (Paris, Picard).

In the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for February M. Ch. Petit-Dutaillis reviews the work that has been done and the questions that remain to be treated in regard to the political history of France in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. His article is especially apropos in view of the recent appearance of seven of the eight fascicles of the *Lavissee Histoire de France* in which MM. Coville and Petit-Dutaillis deal with the period from 1328 to 1492. A similar article will be devoted to the social and moral history of the same period. The preceding number of the *Revue* contained a survey of this sort in regard to the industrial history of France from the Renaissance to the Revolution, by M. Albert Milhaud.

The report on the administration of the archives in France from 1890 to 1901, presented by M. Gustave Servois on the eve of retiring from the post of Director of Archives, will be of special value to many students of history, from the fact that it contains an *État des Inventaires des Archives Nationales, Départementales, Communales et Hospitalières*. This part of the report gives particularly a list of the indexes, inventories, and so on, already completed or in progress, that are now available for facilitating research.

The second volume of the *Histoire de la Représentation diplomatique de la France auprès des Cantons suisses, de leurs Confédérés et de leurs Alliés*, by Édouard Rott, lately issued at Paris by F. Alcan, covers the years 1559 to 1610.

A *Répertoire Historique et Biographique de la Gazette de France depuis l'Origine jusqu'à la Révolution (1631-1790)*, by the Marquis de Granges de Surgères, will be published in four quarto volumes, each of some four to five hundred double-column pages (Paris, H. Leclerc).

One of the most important subjects in the history of French law and justice has lately been treated by M. Gustave Ducoudray, in an elaborate work of over a thousand pages: *Les Origines du Parlement de Paris et la Justice aux XIII^e et XIV^e Siècles* (Paris, Hachette).

M. S. Charley, of the University of Lyons, is performing notable services for the history of his region. Besides founding recently a local review which is meeting with cordial approval, *Revue d'Histoire de Lyon*, he is about to bring out a critical bibliography of the history of Lyons to 1789. This, moreover, is to be followed in about two years by a similar volume for the period since 1789.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. M. Besse, *Les premiers Monastères de la Gaule Méridionale* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April); Thomas Hodgkin, *Richelieu and His Policy* (English Historical Review, January); Amédée Droin, *L'Expulsion des Jésuites sous Henri IV, leur Rappel*, concluded (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, March); G. Hanotaux, *Richelieu Cardinal et premier Ministre* (Revue des Deux Mondes, March 1); René Moreux, *La Situation de la France dans le Levant à la Fin du XVIII^e Siècle*, concluded (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, March); Paul Mantoux, *Talleyrand en 1830* (Revue Historique, March).

ITALY, SPAIN.

Some progress has been made recently upon the collected works of two Italians prominent in the history of the "Risorgimento." The last of three volumes of *Carlo Cattaneo. Scritti Politici ed Epistolario Pubblicati da Gabriele Rosa e Jessie White Mario* (Florence, G. Barbèra) has appeared. These volumes supplement the seven volumes of *Cattaneo. Opere Edite ed Inedite Raccolte da Agostino Bertani* (Florence, Le-Monnier) and complete the publication of Cattaneo's collected works, as projected by his friends and disciples. However, some of his writings have been omitted from the collection, including his historically important *Dell'Insurrezione di Milano nell'1848 e delle Successiva Guerra*. Also the eighth volume of *Aurelio Saffi. Ricordi e Scritti Pubblicati per Cura del Municipio di Forlì* (Florence, G. Barbèra) has lately been published. It contains Saffi's writings during the years 1864-1866; other volumes containing his later writings will follow.

It is a pleasure to note that the fifty-eighth and final volume of the *Diarii di Marino Sanuto* is announced to appear shortly. This publication has been in progress nearly twenty-five years (Milan, Hoepli).

Professor Villari's account of Italy in the time of the invasions has been issued in English in two volumes: *The Barbarian Invasion of Italy* (London, Unwin). The price (32 shillings), however, is greatly above that of the modest little volume in Italian.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Schiaparelli, *Le Carte antiche dell'Archivio cabitolare de S. Pietro in Vaticano*, continued (Archivio della R. Società Romana, XXIV., 3-4); P. Egidi, *Le Croniche di Viterbo scritte da Frate Francesco d'Andrea*, concluded (Ibid.); G. Desdèvises du Dezert, *Le Conseil de Castille au XVIII^e Siècle*, first article (Revue Historique, May).

GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

The publications for 1901-1902 in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* include, outside of Vol. XXVII. of the *Neues Archiv*, only P. de Winterfeld's edition of the works of Nun Hrothsvitha: *Hrothsvitha Opera Omnia*. The committee has in press, however, eight quarto volumes, some of which are expected to be ready for distribution in the course of the year.

The ninth number in Dr. G. Steinhausen's first series of "Monographien zur deutschen Kulturgeschichte" deals with German schools before Pestalozzi: G. Reicke, *Lehrer und Unterrichtswesen in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Leipzig, E. Diederichs). There are one hundred and thirty illustrations, out of the period from the 15th to the 18th century.

A two-volume work relating to the history of Hungary from 1526 to 1722 has lately been published at Paris: Albert Lefavre, *Les Magyars pendant la Domination Ottomane en Hongrie* (Perrin et Cie).

Several important publications of sources relating to the history of Switzerland have lately been made by one or another of the Swiss societies. Volume XX. of *Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte*, issued under the auspices of the General Swiss Historical Society, contains over seven hundred pieces on the Swabian war: *Aktenstücke zur Geschichte des Schwabenkrieges, nebst einer Freiburger Chronik über die Ereignisse von 1499*, edited by A. Büchi (Basel, Basler Buch- und Antiquariatshandlung). The Historical Society of the Canton of Berne has completed, with the sixth volume, E. Bloesch's edition of *Die Berner-Chronik des Valerius Anshelm* (Bern, Wyss): this last volume relates to the years 1530-1536 and is of special interest for the history of the Swiss Reformation and the troubles between Bern and Savoy. The Society of Jurists has begun a new series relating to Swiss law with the first volume of F. E. Welti's *Stadtrechte* of Bern, from 1218 to 1539 (Aarau, Sauerländer). Also, the first number of a new series of "Publications" issued by the Society for Popular Traditions may be added to the list, since it is less a history than a collection of materials: *Geschichte der Reliquien in der Schweiz*, by E. A. Stückelberg (Zurich).

After studies extending over more than twenty years, J. Hunziker began the publication, in 1900, of a nine-volume work on the rural house in Switzerland: *Das Schweizerhaus nach seinen landschaftlichen Formen und seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Unfortunately death interrupted his labors the following year, while the second volume was in the press (Aarau, Sauerländer); but it is hoped that his plans may still be carried out.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Egelhaaf, *Gustav Adolf und die deutschen Reichsstädte* (*Deutsche Rundschau*, May and June); Wolfgang Michael, *Wallensteins Vertrag mit dem Kaiser im Jahre 1632* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXVIII., 3); Georg Kaufmann, *Ranke und die Beurteilung Friedrich Wilhelms IV.* (*Historische Zeitschrift*,

LXXXVIII., 3); F. Rachfahl, *Zur Beurteilung König Friedrich Wilhelms IV. und der Berliner Märzrevolution* (Historische Vierteljahrsschrift, April); R. Ehrenberg, *Entstehung und Bedeutung grosser Vermögen. IV. Die Brüder Siemens* (Deutsche Rundschau, April and May); L. Krauss, *L'Évolution du Pangermanisme au dix-neuvième Siècle et la Diplomatie* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, July to April).

BELGIUM.

A brief review of the most recent historical work in Belgium is given in the "Courrier Belge," by M. A. Delescluse, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for April.

M. Michel Huisman has made a noteworthy contribution to the history of Belgium by his *La Belgique Commerciale sous l'Empereur Charles VI. La Compagnie d'Ostende* (Paris, Picard).

A considerable volume, by R. Dollot, is devoted to *Les Origines de la Neutralité de la Belgique et le Système de la Barrière (1609-1830)* (Paris, Alcan).

A Belgian Historical Institute has recently been established at Rome, on the model of the Prussian Institute.

AMERICA.

A study of the manuscripts in the Library of Congress, by C. H. Lincoln, is contributed to the March number of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. While not a bibliography it is intended to serve as an introduction to the valuable collection it describes, and especially to the documents of interest to students of economic history.

The New Amsterdam Company has begun a series of reprints of early American travels and frontier studies with the publication of *Lewis and Clark's Travels* in three volumes after the edition of 1814, Mackenzie's *History of the Fur Trade and Voyages to the Arctic* in two volumes, and Cadwallader Colden's *History of the Five Indian Nations*.

A. C. McClurg announces a series of reprints of Americana to begin with *Hennepin's Travels*, a facsimile of the edition of 1698, edited by R. G. Thwaites, annotated and indexed. *The History of the Expedition of Captains Lewis and Clark*, with an introduction by James K. Hosmer is to appear in the fall.

An article of bibliographical interest for early Catholic Church history in the United States is the "Index of Historical Pamphlets in the Library of St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pennsylvania," published in *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* for March.

The Bibliographer for March reproduces a page from White's *First Century of Scandalous, Malignant Priests*, London, 1643, containing an account of the ejection from his living of Lawrence Washington, an ancestor of George Washington.

A valuable volume prepared in the office of the superintendent of documents at Washington has just been issued. The title is *Tables of*

and *Annotated Index to the Congressional Series of United States Public Documents*. It is the second part of a large volume which will be fully indexed. The first part is a list of documents of the first fourteen congresses. The third part will contain a list of the reports and miscellaneous publications of the departments and bureaus of the government.

In the April number of *American Catholic Historical Researches*, the editor, M. I. J. Griffin, continues his double task of hunting down and controverting unfounded claims of Catholic influence in American history, and of printing a large and miscellaneous collection of authentic documents relative to the early Catholic Church in America. Among the most interesting documents in the current number is a translation of the charge of the bishop of Quebec providing for the celebration of the evacuation of Quebec by Arnold's force on December 31, 1775.

The journal kept by Charles Porterfield from March 3, to July 23, 1776, while a prisoner in Quebec, appears in the *Publications of the Southern Historical Association* for March.

A limited edition of *The Journal of James Melvin, private soldier in Arnold's expedition against Quebec in 1775*, which has already been printed will be reissued by H. W. Bryant, of Portland, Maine, with annotations by A. A. Melvin.

A publication of interest to students of Revolutionary history is announced by C. E. Goodspeed of Boston, in *The Letters of Hugh, Earl Percy, from Boston and New York, 1775-1776*, edited by C. K. Bolton of the Boston Athenæum.

Two books in defence of Aaron Burr recently published are Charles Burr Todd's *The True Aaron Burr* (A. S. Barnes), which is based upon traditions of Burr handed down by his law pupils, and I. Jenkinson's *Aaron Burr, His Personal and Political Relations with Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton*, published by the author, Richmond, Indiana.

The letters published in the March, April and May *Bulletins of the Boston Public Library* belong with few exceptions to the second and third decades of the last century and are concerned very largely with the presidential campaign of 1828. There is one letter by Aaron Burr to Governor Alston dated November 15, 1815, denouncing Monroe with extreme bitterness and urging the nomination of Jackson in order to break down the Virginia dynasty; one by Monroe describes Jackson's career as military governor of Florida; two by G. M. Dallas describe the Jackson campaign in Pennsylvania; one by Clay discusses the results of Jackson's election.

The hundredth anniversary of the graduation of Daniel Webster from Dartmouth College was celebrated at Hanover last September. The addresses delivered at that time, with some account of the proceedings, have been published by the college in an attractive volume. The centennial oration was given by Samuel W. McCall. Professor Charles F. Richardson spoke on Webster's college life, and Professor John Kingsford on the development of the college since the Dartmouth College case.

Two exceedingly important papers were read before the Massachusetts Historical Society at the January meeting. The first was on John Quincy Adams and the Monroe Doctrine, by Worthington C. Ford. This number of the REVIEW contains a different presentation of the same subject by Mr. Ford, and the reader may thus judge of the importance of the material which has recently been brought to light from among the papers of the Adams family at Quincy. Mr. Charles Francis Adams likewise made a thorough examination of the papers at Quincy in search of material that should show the connection of John Quincy Adams with the Emancipation Proclamation, the only other presidential utterance which could be compared with the famous message of Monroe. The documentary matter here disclosed is of great significance and interest; in one way it does not connect Adams very intimately with Lincoln's famous state paper; but it shows that, time and again, with characteristic persistence and courage Adams asserted the authority of the National Government to abolish slavery under the war power, and that facing the real facts he foresaw with remarkable clearness what the end was likely to be. The two articles have been reprinted and put forth in a volume (Cambridge, John Wilson, 1902).

The papers read at the October meeting of the American Antiquarian Society have just been published in the *Proceedings* (Vol. XIV., New Series, Part 3). A paper by Senator George F. Hoar on Charles Allen of Worcester gives an interesting and valuable account of the division of the Whig party in Massachusetts after the annexation of Texas.

A number of reminiscences of Appomattox are published in the April *Century* under the following titles: "Lee at Appomattox," by E. P. Alexander, Brigadier General, C. S. A.; "The Last Days of Lee's Army," by C. Marshall, Colonel, C. S. A.; "Personal Recollections of Appomattox," by John Gibbons, Major General, U. S. A.; "Notes on the Surrender of Lee," by Major General W. Merritt, U. S. A.

Volume XXIX. of the *Southern History Society Papers* for 1901 is devoted entirely to brief papers on events of the Civil War from a strongly Confederate point of view. The longest is that containing the account of the celebration at New Orleans in June, 1901, of the ninety-third anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis. The most interesting, perhaps, is the "Report of the History Committee of the Camp of Confederate Veterans" at Petersburg, Virginia, October 25, 1901, by G. L. Christian, which proves "from federal testimony" that the Northern soldiers "violated every rule they had laid down for the government of their armies" and waged war "with a savage cruelty unknown in the history of civilization." The committee wishes to counteract the unhistorical assertions regarding the conduct of the war commonly found in Northern histories.

Two Treaties of Paris and the Supreme Court is the somewhat indecriptive title of a small book by Sidney Webster (New York, Harpers, 1901, pp. 133), dealing with the constitutional problems arising in the

recent insular cases. It is strongly and cleverly written and contains some suggestive historical matter, especially excerpts from Polk's diary which refer to the situation in California.

The New York Historical Society has presented a memorial to Mayor Low of New York, urging the printing of the minutes of the common council, 1675-1776, hitherto unpublished, and offering to co-operate in any practicable way. It also urges that the old town records of Jamaica, Flushing and Westchester be deposited in New York in order to insure their preservation.

The state historian of New York announces the forthcoming publication of the documents gathered by E. T. Corwin in Holland. These relate principally to the seventeenth century and will serve to supplement Brodhead's collection.

The different series running in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* are continued in the April number, including the letters to Margaret Shippen Arnold; Dean Tucker's Pamphlet with Franklin's annotations; the "Memoirs of Brigadier General Lacy," and the "Letters of Presidents of the United States and Ladies of the White House." Among the last are letters on political matters from Fillmore, Buchanan and Lincoln. The publication of a new Hessian diary is begun under the title "Popp's Journal, 1777-1783," translated by J. G. Rosengarten. With the diary, which is rather brief and fragmentary, are reproduced three military maps which were bound with the original manuscript. Another interesting reproduction is a facsimile of the *Philadelphische Zeitung*, No. 1., May 6, 1832, printed by Franklin, the first German paper in America.

Mr. Morgan Poitiaux Robinson contributed to the April and May numbers of *The Oracle*, Richmond, Virginia, a thorough and interesting study of "The Evolution of the Mason and Dixon Line." The article has been reprinted and published as a separate pamphlet.

The Maryland Historical Society has just issued as number thirty-seven of its "Fund Publications," *Reverend Thomas Bray, his Life and Selected Works relating to Maryland*, edited by B. C. Steiner. The subject of this biography, eminent as founder of the "Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge" and the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," was particularly connected with Maryland, which he visited at the end of the seventeenth century for the purpose of securing the legal establishment of the English church in the colony. The letters and addresses here published relate largely to his efforts in this direction and are supplemented by some other contemporary documents bearing on the subject, the most interesting being an analysis of the membership of the Maryland assembly for the purpose of estimating the probable vote of the delegates on the establishment question.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for April contains a number of contributions of unusual historical interest. In addition to further installments of the series of "Abridgments of Virginia Colo-

nial laws," the "Records of Henry County" and abstracts from the Sainsbury collection, the publication is begun of the "Proceedings of the Virginia Committee of Correspondence," accompanied by copious notes. The John Brown letters, deposited by order of Governor Wise but lost for over thirty years, are announced for publication. They were discovered recently by W. W. Scott, the state librarian, who contributes an introductory article upon them to this number of the magazine.

The facsimile reprint of Hariot's "Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia," begun in the first number of the *Bibliographer*, is completed in the February and March issues.

The rare tract called *The Discoveries of John Lederer in Three Several Marches from Virginia to the West of Carolina*, first published in London in 1672, has been reprinted for George P. Humphrey, Rochester, New York.

"Literature for the Study of the Colonial History of South Carolina" is surveyed by W. R. Smith in the April number of the new *South Atlantic Quarterly*.

Among the many South Carolina statesmen who have been perhaps unduly overshadowed by the fame of Calhoun, one of the ablest was Hugh Legaré, prominent during the first half of the last century as a states' rights leader, anti-nullifier and Whig. His career is described in the January and April numbers of the *Sewanee Review* by B. J. Ramage.

The *American Historical Magazine*, published hitherto by the historical department of the Peabody Normal College at Nashville, Tennessee, will hereafter be the organ of the Tennessee Historical Society, and the editorship, hitherto in the hands of W. R. Garrett, will be assumed by A. V. Goodpasture and a committee of the society. During the past year this magazine has printed a quantity of material of value for western history including "Records of Washington County, 1777-1782"; "Letters from General Coffee, 1813-1815"; "Papers of General Daniel Smith, 1783-1817"; and "Indian Treaties of Tennessee" by J. M. Lea. In the number for April, the publication is begun of the "Records of the Cumberland Association," from January, 1783, in the shape of Minutes of the Committee of the Association. This committee practically acted as a judicial body, and the minutes are, therefore, of the highest interest from the light they throw on frontier conditions.

In the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for April, E. O. Randall writes on "Ohio in Early History and during the Revolution"; C. D. Laylin contributes an interesting article, with a map, upon the "Firelands Grant," comprising the western end of the Connecticut Reserve; and C. E. Slocum and R. W. Macfarland call attention to erroneous statements concerning topography in recent books or articles on early Ohio history.

Mr. W. E. Henry, state librarian of Indiana, has compiled and printed privately the state platforms of the two dominant political parties

in Indiana, 1850-1900 (Indianapolis, 1902). The value of the book is enhanced by a subject index.

A year ago an act of the Alabama legislature established "The Alabama State Department of Archives and History" charging it with the custody of the archives, the collection of historical material, the publication of state official records and the encouragement of historical research. This department, according to the *Library Journal* of March, is now being organized by the director, Thomas M. Owen. His plans, which deserve the hearty approval of all and especial support from the state, include the arrangement and indexing of the state archives, the collection of all printed and manuscript historical material relating to Alabama, the development of a museum, the compilation of the Alabama war records and the publication of the report of the Alabama history commission.

Volumes IV. and V. of the *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society* contain a number of valuable and interesting papers. Possibly special mention should be made of "The First Struggle over Secession in Mississippi" by James W. Garner; "Reconstruction in East and Southeast Mississippi" by Captain W. H. Hardy; "Mississippi's Constitution and Statutes in Reference to Freedmen and their Alleged Relation to the Reconstruction Acts and War Amendments" by A. H. Stone. Volume V. is largely taken up with the report of the Mississippi historical commission, dealing chiefly with manuscripts, papers and documents relating to the state.

Under the title "The Mines of Spain," Judge Oliver P. Shiras contributes to the April number of the *Annals of Iowa* an article on the Dubuque land claim with a facsimile of an early map. Another article of interest is "Chapters in Iowa's Financial History," by F. I. Herriott.

The leading article in the April *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* is a careful study, from the sources, of "The Quarrel between Governor Smith and the Provisional Government of the Republic," by W. R. Smith. The article ascribes to this quarrel the disasters which befell the Texans at the opening of the campaign of 1836.

In the Footprints of the Padres by Charles Warren Stoddard is the title of a book some portion of which may appeal to those interested in the American settlement of California. It consists chiefly of reminiscences of a trip across the isthmus in 1855 and of the conditions in San Francisco in the early days (San Francisco, Robertson, 1902).

The Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society for March contains several important articles on Oregon history, among them "The Social Evolution of Oregon" by James R. Robertson; "The Political History of Oregon from 1865 to 1876," Part II., by Wm. D. Fenton.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. N. Thorpe, *What is a Constitutional History of the United States?* (*Annals of the American Academy*, March); E. E. Merriam, *The Political Theory of Jefferson* (*Political Science Quarterly*, March); D. C. Barrett, *The Supposed Necessity of a*

Legal Tender Paper (Quarterly Journal of Economics, May); F. C. Cook, *Oliver Ellsworth and Federation* (Atlantic Monthly, April); Henrietta Dana Skinner, *New Light on Revolutionary Diplomacy* (Harpers, April); T. W. Page, *The Earlier Commercial Policy of the United States* (Journal of Political Economy, March); R. E. Fast, *A Southern Experiment in Township Government* (Sewanee Review, April); F. W. Moore, *Louisiana Politics from 1862-1866* (South Atlantic Quarterly, April); E. E. Sparks, *Formative Incidents in American Diplomacy* (Chautauquan, May and June).

